



University of North Dakota  
**UND Scholarly Commons**

---

Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects

---

January 2016

# The Invocative Use Of The Bible's Rhetorical Power In The Transcripts Of Anne Hutchinson's Trials

Carolyn D. Baker

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

## Recommended Citation

Baker, Carolyn D., "The Invocative Use Of The Bible's Rhetorical Power In The Transcripts Of Anne Hutchinson's Trials" (2016).  
*Theses and Dissertations*. 1868.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/1868>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [zeinebyousif@library.und.edu](mailto:zeinebyousif@library.und.edu).

THE INVOCATIVE USE OF THE BIBLE'S RHETORICAL POWER IN THE  
TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S TRIALS

by

Carolyn Denise Baker  
Bachelor of Arts, Luther Rice Seminary, 1980  
Master of Divinity, Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, 1984  
Doctor of Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1996  
Master of Arts, University of North Dakota 2005

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks

May

2016

This dissertation, submitted by Carolyn Denise Baker in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

---

Dr. Eric Wolfe, Chairperson

---

Dr. Sharon Carson

---

Dr. Chris Nelson

---

Dr. Adame Kitzes

---

Dr. Cynthia Prescott

This dissertation is being submitted by the appointed advisory committee as having met all of the requirements of the School of Graduate Studies at the University of North Dakota and is hereby approved.

---

Dr. Wayne Swisher,  
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

---

April 25, 2016

## PERMISSION

Title           The Invocative Use of the Bible's Rhetorical Power in the  
                  Transcripts of Anne Hutchinson's Trials

Department   English

Degree        Doctor of Philosophy

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in their absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the School of Graduate Studies. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Name: Carolyn Denise Baker

Date: April 25, 2016

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. THE INVOCATIVE USE OF THE BIBLE'S RHETORICAL POWER IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S TRIALS—THE FOCUS, NEED, AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY .....	1
The Focus of This Study.....	1
The Need for This Study.....	2
A Methodology for This Study.....	18
A Preview of This Study.....	22
II. WINTHROP AND COTTON'S INVOCATIVE USE OF THE BIBLE'S RHETORICAL POWER IN THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY WRITINGS.....	28
Introduction.....	28
Approach, Definitions, and Use of the Terms 'Literal', Literalism', 'Allegorical', and 'Typological' .....	29
Winthrop and Cotton's Literalistic Uses of Biblical Texts.....	34
Winthrop and Cotton's Typological Transformations and the Rhetorical Invocations .....	58
Some Selected Representative Uses of Winthrop and Cotton's Use of Allegory.....	66
Chapter Summary .....	70

III.	WINTHROP, COTTON, AND HUTCHINSON’S LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF MEANINGS IN THE COLONY’S PROTESTANT BIBLE AND THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON’S CIVIC TRIAL (NOVEMBER 1637) .....	74
	Introduction.....	74
	The Use of the Bible during the Civic Trial (November 1637) .....	79
	Chapter Conclusion.....	112
IV.	WINTHROP, COTTON, AND HUTCHINSON’S LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF MEANING IN THE COLONY’S PROTESTANT BIBLE AND THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON’S ECCLESIASTICAL TRIAL (MARCH 15 1638) .....	114
	Introduction.....	114
	The Colony’s Charges against Hutchinson and the Literalistic Use of the Bible .....	114
	The Colony’s Banishment of Hutchinson and the Literalistic Use of the Bible .....	132
	Chapter Summary .....	148
V.	EPILOGUE, OR LESSONS LEARNED FROM LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL READINGS OF MEANINGS FOUND IN THE COLONY’S PROTESTANT BIBLE, AS WELL AS THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON’S CIVIL (NOVEMBER 1637) AND ECCLESIASTICAL TRIAL (MARCH 1638)....	150
	Introduction.....	150
	Perspectives from the Past .....	151
	Problems in the Past and Present .....	156
	A Possible Remedy .....	167

Conclusion .....	170
Questions for Further Discussion.....	171
REFERENCES .....	172

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to offer thanks to my committee who guided my thinking and writing: Dr. Sharon Carson, Dr. Eric Wolfe, Dr. Chris Nelson, Dr. Adam Kitzes, and Dr. Cynthia Prescott.

I would also like to thank the English Department of the University of North Dakota for their partially funding my research for this project. Thank you for monies you gave me to travel in England and experience the environs of Cotton and Hutchinson in the cities of London, Boston, and Alford.

Thank you Mayville State University for also partially finding my research for this project. Thank you for monies and the allotted time you also gave me to travel to England. I wish to thank my Division Chair, Dr. Dalton Mc Mahon, and our Administrators: Dr. Gary Hagen, Dr. Keith Stenehjem, Dr. Steven Benson, Dr. Ray Gerszewski. Of course, I am indebted to Mrs. Shannon Hoffer for all the times she so patiently and diligently helped me locate the resources I needed for this project.

I thank my dear friend, colleague, former dean, and UND Alumna, Dr. Lavonne Larson. The dissertation process is now completed. It is time again for us to travel the world and both teach and learn from those in need.

Most of all, I thank my Lord for giving me the ability to complete this project.

*Soli Deo Gloria!*



Dedicated to My Teacher

Sharon Carson, Ph.D.

Chester Fritz Distinguished Professor

## ABSTRACT

Generally speaking, some Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritans invoke the rhetorical power of the Protestant Old and New Testaments in their writings to specify and dictate certain courses of action, especially during the period known as the Antinomian Controversy. These authoritarian, dogmatic, directive allusions to Scripture--what I call the invocative use of the Bible's rhetorical power--appear frequently in some specific contemporaneous Massachusetts Bay Colony journals, sermons, and letters. The author employs these uses to establish the literary and interpretive contexts for the rhetorical use of the Bible in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civil and ecclesiastical trials. For example, the author examines some specific ways the Bible is rhetorically used by key Hutchinson accusers. She shows how the Bible is read in literalistic, typological and allegorical ways. She demonstrates the thinking processes associated with these same rhetorical patterns, and how Governor John Winthrop makes invocative uses of the Bible as seen in his *Journal*, letters, and *Short Story*. In the same manner, the writer analyzes Pastor John Cotton's rhetorical uses of the Bible as seen in his sermons and writings. Believing these thinking and rhetorical patterns to also be those of Hutchinson herself, the author uses Winthrop and Cotton's literary contexts to identify and analyze Hutchinson's invocative uses of Scripture in response to both of these leaders. These are seen in the transcripts of her ecclesiastical and civic trial transcripts.

Putting all of this in motion, the researcher demonstrates the ways Winthrop, Cotton, Hutchinson leverage power over the thinking and behaviors of each other during the Antinomian Controversy. This work concludes by analyzing a few examples of how rhetorical readings of Protestant Scriptures have often been used to justify decisions, issues, and thinking in some key moments of American history, both past and present. It ends by suggesting ways American texts both past and present can be read by using the author's own interdisciplinary approach which combines the concerns of a New Historicist literary and New Historicist Bible criticism.

## CHAPTER I

### THE INVOCATIVE USE OF THE BIBLE'S RHETORICAL POWER IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S TRIALS—THE FOCUS, NEED, AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY

#### The Focus of This Study

*An Overview.* Generally speaking, some Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritans invoke the rhetorical power of the Protestant Old and New Testaments in their writings to specify and dictate certain courses of action during the period of the Antinomian Controversy. Their often authoritarian, dogmatic, directive allusions to Scripture--what the author chooses to call their invocative use of the Bible's rhetorical power--appear frequently in their writings. Echoing a basic idea of Foucault that the human struggle for dominance is pervasive and shared by all parties engaged in any kind of struggle, this specific study illustrates how a mutual will to dominance acted out by Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson, displays itself in their direct or indirect rhetorical uses of Scripture.

Since it is through the literary and interpretive contexts of contemporaneous 17<sup>th</sup> century Massachusetts Bay Colony journals, sermons, and letters that a rhetorical use of the Bible can best be illuminated, these sources are used sources to enlighten the way the Bible is used in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civil and ecclesiastical trials. The specific ways Cotton and Winthrop rhetorically and mutually use the Bible in order to achieve and sustain control of their audiences are highlighted. This work also isolates, posits, and explains some of their thinking processes behind these rhetorical patterns seen in their

works, whether it be Governor John Winthrop's *Model of Christian Charity*, his *Journal*, his selected letters, or his *Short Story*; or Pastor John Cotton's selected sermons and writings, such as *God's Promise to His Plantation*, his *Twelve Fundamental Articles of Religion*, or his *Retraction of His Former Opinion Concerning Baptism*.

Believing and showing how these literalistic, typological, or allegorical patterns of thought belong to Hutchinson too, this research emphasizes how her responses to accusers during the civic and ecclesiastical trials are exactly like those of Winthrop and Cotton. Her identical rhetorical uses of Scripture during her ecclesiastical and civic trial transcripts appearing in John Cotton's *Short Story*, his *Journal*, and Ezra Stiles *Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* are illustrated

Finally, it seems this is not just a 17<sup>th</sup> century Massachusetts Bay Colony scenario. It is one that has also been repeated in critical moments of American history. Therefore, this analysis uses select examples of how rhetorical readings of Protestant Scriptures have been used to influence or dominate some social and political discussions during certain crises, both past and present. It illustrates how the use of a Bible infused rhetoric is not unique to the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Recognizing the power struggles present within these transcripts, this analysis also praises the desirability and necessity of such for our own day, too. It celebrates Hutchinson's contribution to such a struggle. It sees Hutchinson not as a victim of an unjust trial. It maintains how that she is a victorious resistor both during and after it.

### **The Need for This Study**

*A Need for Understanding the Transcript's Language that is Historically and Theologically Specific.* Is there really a need for this type of study in our day? The author

believes the answer to be an emphatic ‘yes’. Perhaps the greatest need for an analysis of this kind relates to what some critics perceive as a general decline of theological literacy with regard to it in early American literature.

Writing in the year 2000, David Shields in his article “Joy and Dread among the Early Americanists” says how “theological literacy among early Americanists has declined and no one reading manuscripts submitted to the academic presses and journals during the past decade can escape [this] conviction” (639). Later Michael Kaufman in his 2008 article “Post-Secular Puritans” also suggests the same:

Shields’s assessment underscores a general trend in scholarship toward explaining the Antinomian Controversy, and Hutchinson’s role in it, in anything but religious terms: It is about gender, or racial conflict, or economics, or ideology, or subversive politics, or language, or rhetoric. And while there had always been strong scholarship that took religion into account, Shields and others seem to suggest that we have gone too far, that we have been reading present-day secular concerns back into a language that is historically and theologically specific. If we really want to understand the controversy, we need – as David Hall has recently written—to be ‘fully comfortable restoring theological ideas to the center of the story’. (637)

Shields, Kaufmann’s, and Hall’s views also seem currently viable in the year 2016. The author’s perusal of Hutchinson critics for this project supports their views. In her opinion also, significant critical work is lacking which attempts to understand the Biblical and theological language of these transcripts. A reading which attempts to understand the social and political expressions in relationship to Biblical and theological literacies are a pre-requisite. These make a productive analysis of Hutchinson’s transcripts possible. Kaufmann’s perception that a 21st century lack of attempts to understand a “language that is historically and theologically specific” (“Post-Secular

Puritans” 637) seems to require a study like this. But there is also another reason why this study is needed.

*The Conjoined Relationship of the Social/Political/Theological in Hutchinson’s World.* As greater attention is paid to the nature of the religious language appearing in the transcripts, the union of Bible/theology with the social and political realms of Hutchinson becomes even more evident. In Hutchinson’s world, the social and political integrally connect themselves with the Bible, its hermeneutics, its theology, and of course the rhetoric deriving from all three. As will be seen in the transcripts of Hutchinson’s trial, the Colonial interpreters of the Bible express themselves both to and through their perceptions of social/political conditions. Conversely, these social/political conditions shape the expectations for what the Bible can, and in their opinion, must be made to mean. Both are not just related. They are one.

According to Christopher Hill in his work *The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution*, “Scripture was accepted as the ultimate authority on economics, and politics no less than on religion and morals” (31). This project, then, is in response to a non-existing historic bifurcation between the social/political and the biblical/theological dimensions of Massachusetts Bay life. By upholding an essential union of the biblical and social in Hutchinson’s world, this analysis attempts in David Hall’s words to restore the theological ideas to the center of the story” (451) appearing in Hutchinson transcripts. By so doing, the author hopes to appropriately intermingle the social and theological dimensions in ways which defy compartmentalization. And yet, there is also a third reason why this study is needed.

*The Potential for Greater Clarity.* Too little has been said about the use of Bible language within these transcripts. A ‘reading of the readings’ seems way overdue. Understanding how Cotton, Winthrop, and Hutchinson read the Bible helps readers to more clearly grasp its uses and meanings in the transcripts themselves. Indeed for many upon first glance these transcripts seem peculiar and opaque, to say the least. Biblical references seem to appear in these texts as cherry picked. Bible texts are clearly wrested from their ancient contexts. Literalistic hermeneutical practices-- those which regard the Bible as a Rule Book and never a piece of literature-- transform Bible meanings into those dictated by a colonial interpreter’s social/political agenda. Whether separately or together, Hutchinson’s, Cotton’s or Winthrop’s allegorical and typological readings of these Texts often seem puzzling, or downright bizarre.

For example, understanding Cotton’s, Winthrop’s, and Hutchinson’s literalistic ways of reading the Bible explains their strange correlations and applications of it to Colony governance. As will be seen, Cotton and Hutchinson’s use of hermeneutical literalism endorses their agenda to silence those who would defend Hutchinson, even her son. Or, perhaps the use of literalism illuminates Hutchinson’s agenda of resistance when she says that “the Law is not a rule of Life [which all are expected to obey]” (*Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 181). Recognizing how all three trial participants literalistically use Protestant Scripture to invoke the actions of their listener is essential for making these arcane transcripts understandable.

So then, understanding *how* and *why* the Bible is used in certain ways by these three individuals helps clarify the very social/political issues that they address and govern. It makes the transcripts less arcane and mysterious for twenty-first century



readers. Obviously, there will always be the question: ‘Was their literalistic use of the Bible as a rhetorical tool meant to solely serve their social agendas? Or, perhaps ‘Were their social agendas a direct result of their literalistic understanding the Bible?’ And while definite answers to either of these questions remain speculative at best, a strong case can be made for how their Bible and agendas existed in a symbiotic relationship. So mutually interdependent as to be almost indiscernible, their Bible interpretations so guided colonial life that it was probably difficult to discern any distinction between the two. Reading these transcripts for the literalism which clarifies them also seems to be one more way to address Hall’s concern of “return[ing] the theologies [in these texts] to the center of the story” (“Post Secular” 39).

*A Need for an Inter-Disciplinary Reading of These Transcripts* This study, then, is a brand new undertaking in this area, as well as an interdisciplinary approach. It examines a set of transcripts from 1637-1638, court records which are some of the earliest American texts which document the ways the Bible was read to address or repress social justice. These transcripts testify to what those living below at the grass roots level (Hutchinson and her followers) are willing to do and say in the name of intellectual freedom to challenge those who reign over them (Winthrop and Cotton). In this respect, these transcripts reflect a kind of liberation theology. They serve also as an enduring testimonial to an intellectual activism present in the Colony as particularly led by Hutchinson.

So in light of these qualities, the author works as an inter-disciplinarian. She reads the transcripts of Anne Hutchinson’s trial through two distinct yet related lenses: those of literary criticism and Biblical criticism. She equally uses the insights which both

disciplines inspire. Up to now, these separate approaches have never been used together in such emphatic and equal amounts. Yet by reading these texts with the questions which these two types of criticism suggest, the author believes her readers can gain new insights about these transcripts, particularly. And since this study emphasizes *how* meanings are made, and not just *what* meanings are made, the researcher believes her methodology can be replicated even minimally and used again by others with similar early American texts. This is the key value of her work for her readers.

For example, a literary critical reading of these 1637-1638 texts helps readers to pay particular attention to the dimensions of power that are indeed operative there. By reading these texts in this way one can isolate the motif of power, its exercise, and its resistance. This kind of reading which pays particular attention to the ever present plight of human struggle isolates John Cotton and John Winthrop as the oppressors, and Anne Hutchinson as the resistor. Reading with this kind of New Historicist literary sensitivity, a reader can see both the authoritarianism and the liberation inherent within the transcripts. Readers also can see Hutchinson for who she truly was-- a victor not just a victim, someone whose intellectual activism challenged the conditions of her day.

A literary critical reading of these transcripts also helps readers to see power as a perennial issue. Power, its use and abuse, its exercise or its resistance, are not just part of an antiquated 1637-1638 past. This past, of course, extends well beyond Hutchinson's times and shows up later in American history. It even haunts the present. For example, the expected subjugation of Hutchinson to her family or church because of her gender is quite similar to the suppression of slaves to their masters because of their pigmentation. Through this study, readers see how the arbitrary rules and rulings of the elders are not

unlike some ministers in modern pastorates. Cotton and Winthrop's insistence that their agenda driven readings of the Bible should dictate the decisions of Puritan Society are not unlike a later period when rhetoricians used the Bible to insist that America should go to war against England. And indeed the list could continue. Nevertheless, this kind of interdisciplinary reading of the transcripts which makes use of a New Historicist demeanor demonstrates how a Puritan past has not really passed. The Puritan past is in fact a very big part of our present times.

*A Need for a New Historicist Reading of the Transcripts.* Not only is this project a response to 1.) a lack of a twenty-first century attempt to understand a "language that is historically and theologically specific" (Kaufmann 637); 2.) the conjoined relationship of the social/political/theological in Hutchinson's world; 3.) the greater clarity which results from said approach; this study also comprises a 4.) New Historicist response to the transcripts. Presently, it seems as if there is a dearth of New Historicist voices who offer their readings of these transcripts in the ways this project attempts to do. This study does not employ the older historical critical approach, the kind which seeks to understand the transcripts only as regards the biographical and social backgrounds of its participants. This study of the transcripts does not primarily concern itself with the ideas and values of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century Colony reflected in them.

Rather, much like Washington State University's Michael Delahoyde's definition of a New Historicist, this work attempts to understand and express the meanings in Hutchinson's transcripts by analyzing them "within the framework of the prevailing ideas and assumptions of its historical era". As a New Historicist reading, this study looks for the ways these transcripts provide a source of social/political commentary and insight

into the power issues associated with Hutchinson's trials. It does not look for "a truth" but rather a "cultural construct" offered by these transcripts. These transcripts are examined, then, for ways in which a cultural perspective "produce[s] and reproduce[s] themselves" in later times, as well as our day. The ways these writings illuminate an "historically specific model of truth and authority" are addressed ("Introduction to Literature").

This New Historicist approach is particularly interested in how a history demonstrated in these transcripts like Delahoyde's definition "reveals ways of thinking" ("Introduction to Literature") during Hutchinson's moments, specifically, how the Colony presented in these transcripts understands and directs itself socially. This study is interested in its hierarchy, and especially its belief about the life governing power of its 'Rule Book', the Protestant Scriptures.

As a New Historicist reading, this work is also very interested in the socio-historical. It seeks to understand and then explain how these transcripts speak not just *about* their generation but also *to* others, and especially ours. Again, it does what Delahoyde also describes as Keats approach to an historic urn. "It's not just where Keats would have seen a Grecian urn in England, but from where he may have absorbed the definitions of art and beauty" ("Introduction to Literature"). In this analysis of Hutchinson's transcripts, it is not simply enough to attempt to locate and understand them as mere 17<sup>th</sup> century artifacts. Rather Hutchinson's transcripts are read here with the goal of attempting to understand the many ways they uniquely influence not just an American past, but also an American present and possible future.

And, perhaps most important is this. As alluded to earlier, this specific kind of New Historicist reading devoted to Hutchinson's trials has NEVER been done. In light of this, there is therefore a sixth need for this study.

*A Need for an Analysis of How Cotton, Winthrop, and Hutchinson's Rhetoric Compares.* And just as the use of literary criticism helps readers to see the power and perennial issues appearing in these transcripts; the combined use of a Biblical criticism helps them to also understand how the reading or misreading of the Bible's words reveals, creates and authorizes the power associated with its frequent quotation. When readers examine how Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchison interpret the Bible, they are also able to see how these three read or even rewrite its words to make a rhetorical point or decision, however noble or ignoble. For example, when the court quotes I Timothy 5:17, accusations should not be offered against an elder apart from "two or three witnesses"; the leaders revise the words. They even reword the Text. Two or three witnesses is changed to "two or three visits" to justify their method of gathering evidence against Hutchinson (The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, 162). Reading as a Bible critic with a sensitivity to the actual words of the Bible Text, readers can clearly see how the Bible was misquoted and misread for the sake of justifying an agenda and practice. Comparing what the Bible actually says with what Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson report it to say is often very insightful for understanding their agendas during the trial.

As will be seen in Chapter V, the ways the Bible is used in these transcripts are not atypical. Other Puritans of the period read the Bible in similar ways. In those writings as well as these, the Bible is also most often read literalistically, allegorically, or typologically. Most frequently in the trial's transcripts, Winthrop and Cotton read a Bible

text literalistically when they wish to establish or enforce a rule for the Colony, and especially Hutchinson. In response, viewing herself as their equal, Hutchinson reads the same Bible literalistically in order to resist obeying their rules. Or, perhaps, thinking her opinions just as viable and verifiable, she reads literalistically to counter Winthrop and Cotton's arguments with some new rules of her own. For example, she agrees to obey her leaders, "to honor her parents" (Exodus 20:12). Yet, by choosing to emphasize certain words of the passage Ephesians 6:1-4, she conditionally promises that she will only obey them "in the Lord". Her hermeneutics causes her to find a way to insert an exception in her obedience, and all of this is accomplished by using for her argument the specific wording of the Biblical Text.

Again, when the Bible is not read literalistically (the most common type of reading appearing in these transcripts), it is read typologically. Cotton and Winthrop most often resort to appropriating the salvation history story of Israel for the Colony by reading typologically. They read in this way to promote their vision of the Colony's Divine destiny, as well as the community's responsibility to fulfill their expectations.

While Hutchinson also reads the Bible in these same typological ways which support the Divine calling of the Colony, her readings never emphasize the divine destiny of the nation. She never disagrees with Cotton and Winthrop's readings that the Boston Colony has been sovereignly chosen to collectively fulfill a Divine mission in the world. But she reads typologically for purposes of convincing Winthrop and Cotton of her individual destiny to and within the Colony. She reads to support her view that she is a prophet to this new Israel. She cites Joel 2:28-30 to support her view that God has divinely appointed her as a female prophet to the nation.

And of course, there are moments towards the end of the trial where the use of allegorical readings of Scripture begin to predominate. And the more heated the rhetoric between Hutchinson, Winthrop, and Cotton, the more vivid the language becomes. Winthrop's allegories stemming directly from the Bible ("Jezebel"), or the ones he invents with the Bible as his inspiration ("American Jezebel") are examples of the way allegories are frequently used in all of the dialogs (*Short Story* 60-64). Generally speaking, it seems that all three persons use allegorical readings as a way of describing their feelings about each other. It seems that when the literalistic and typological readings of one person fails to convince the other, then the preference for allegorical readings begin to predominate. And when this happens Bible allegories are then used as a form of name calling. For example, Hutchinson is called by Winthrop a "dog which has returned to its vomit" (*Short Story* 60), or the "whore that is mentioned in Revelation" (*Short Story* 64). In return, Hutchinson also calls Winthrop and Cotton and the entire Boston Church, a "Whore" and a "Strumpet" (*Short Story*, Page Unnumbered). So by recognizing the places where Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson are reading the Bible literalistically, typologically, or allegorically, readers may also be more able to see more clearly the agendas which motivate particular readings.

The Bible is also read by John Cotton according to a three-fold method. As will be seen later, he uses what is known as explanation, collation, and synchrony, to interpret one Text, compare it with other Bible Texts which he believes makes the same point, and then to combine all into a final doctrinal statement. Cotton uses his readings of the Bible to create and prove his broad theological statements. His student Anne Hutchinson does the same.

Again, the Bible is read in all of the above ways to represent divine sanction for certain actions. For example, when Hutchinson is finally banished from the Colony she hears the words of I Corinthians 5:5 pronounced over her as she departs, “I deliver you up to Satan that you may learn no more to blaspheme” (*Short Story* 32). The Court cites Scripture in order to justify that she is a blasphemer and, therefore, must be dealt with in extreme ways. Or, Winthrop referring to Matthew 18:18, says that the fate that the congregation has decided is in fact God’s will: “Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (*Short Story* 60).

Finally, sometimes the Bible is used to hide an agenda. In order to stymy Hutchinson’s free-thinking which challenges the conformity of belief expected by the Court. Winthrop quotes I Timothy 1:2: “I suffer not a woman to teach or to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence” (*Short Story* 37). Or, perhaps Hutchinson in response quotes Joel 2:28-30 to show how God is on her side as a Spirit inspired prophet, and how she will consequently refuse to do as they request. This study also fills another need.

*A Need for a More Holistic Analysis of How the Bible is Literalistically Interpreted in Hutchinson’s Transcripts.* Many have sought to read Hutchinson’s transcripts through the lenses of an older historicism, or merely feminist, psychological, socio-political, and theological ones. Yet to date, there exists no holistic, non-compartmentalized readings of these transcripts, and certainly not one like mine which specifically seeks to understand the unifying ways a literalistically understood Bible shapes or reflects all these issues at work.



It seems that these literary critical responses to Hutchinson's transcripts which pay NO significant attention to the literalistic uses of Scripture occur in two eras: works *before* and works after the 1980's. For example, before the 1980's, Hutchinson is described in 1930 as a feminist by Winifred King Rugg in her work *Unafraid: A Life of Anne Hutchinson* as the "Mother of the Twentieth Century Woman". According to King Rugg, Hutchinson is "a lonely exemplar in newborn America of that freedom of thought, word, and action that women now accept as unthinkingly as the air they breathe" (252-3). There is Edith Curtis, who taking a feminist stance in her 1930 book entitled *Anne Hutchinson: A Biography*, praises Hutchinson who "in contestation with John Winthrop is to be credited with the long lasting contribution to the idea, discussion, and principle of civil liberty" (93). Or, there is Helen Augur in her 1930 *An American Jezebel: The Life of Anne Hutchinson* who specifically demonstrates how Winthrop could not accept that Hutchinson's philosophy and religious views had the right to co-exist with his own (168). But while Rugg and Curtis and Augur's highly representative works speak about feminist concerns, and the role of free thinking as related to other social/political issues of the Colony; once again very much absent are any references to how a literalistically read Bible both directs and reflects all of this.

This kind of trend continues into the 1980's, too. For whatever reasons, and it is indeed interesting to speculate why, the early 1980's witnessed a flurry of critical activity regarding Hutchinson and her trials. Perhaps the women's movement in the United States provided the reasons, freedom, and context to discuss the feminist concerns present in Hutchinson's story? Yet once again, in the

1980's critics characteristically focus only on *what* happened to Hutchinson, but certainly not on *how* the *what* actually happened. There is no mention of *how* both the accused and accusers were guided by literalistic readings of Protestant Scripture.

A very good representative sampling capturing the breadth and depth of these conversations which tend to view the trial in less than holistic ways appears in a highly representative 1981 collection of essays edited by Emery Battis' *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. In his volume, Hutchinson's experiences get pigeon-holed. Her life is analyzed according to separate categories like feminism, gender issues<sup>1</sup>, psychology, theology/religion<sup>2</sup>, or political/social issues<sup>3</sup>. Not only

---

<sup>1</sup>Critics in the 1980's analyze Hutchinson's trials particularly as they pertain to gender issues. For example, a group of critics appearing in a collection of essays edited by Emery Battis *Anne Hutchinson Troubler of Zion*, includes both male and female thinkers like Ben Barker-Benfield ("Anne Hutchinson and the Puritan Attitude Toward Women"), Lyle Koehler ("The Case of the American Jezebel"), Michael Colacurio ("Footsteps of Anne Hutchinson"), and Mary Maples Dunn ("Saints and Sisters"). Emery Battis himself in his essay ("Mrs. Hutchinson's Behavior") even considers Hutchinson's behavior at her trial in light of her supposed menopausal symptoms. Yet questions which seek to discover how literalistic readings of the Bible influenced gender issues, or conversely how gender issues influenced the use of the Bible do not appear.

<sup>2</sup> Some choose to analyze the transcripts through the lenses of Calvinistic theology. For example, there are a few in 1981 who read the trial for its theological ramifications: William K.B. Stoevers ("The Theological Dimension") and Jesper Rosenheimer ("The Image of Adam and the Image of Christ"). Yet, significantly lacking, is this. No critic with whom I am yet familiar focuses on *how* the Calvinistic theologies appearing in the trial transcripts get created from the literalistically read Source.

<sup>3</sup> Others of this same era seem to analyze the procedures of the trials, or perhaps the social dimensions of them. For example, in 1981 an earlier critic from the 1930's Edmund S. Morgan ("The Case against Anne Hutchinson") appears again, yet this time as a revered classic text within a collection of essays edited by Francis Bremer entitled *Anne Hutchinson Troubler of Zion*. Morgan's work alongside that of Richard Morris ("Jezebel before the Judges"), or Anne Witherington, and Jack Schwartz ("The Political Trial") focuses primarily on the procedures of the trials.

does a tendency of this older Hutchinson scholarship to classify religion apart from the totality of life seem unsatisfactory to the author; she also thinks it is not really fruitful for essayist David Hall in his “Antinomian Controversy” (*Troubler of Puritan Zion*) to only attempt to isolate *what* religiously happened to Hutchinson during her trials. Questioning the ways the *why* and *how* fuels the *what* seem to be far more productive. And the author believes the agendas derived from a literalistic use of the Bible to be directly related to the answers of the *why* and *how*.

Focusing, too, on this kind of Bible reading seems to be a way one might read the transcripts more holistically; for it seems that in the transcripts this literalistic use of this Source often creates or reveals the religious, social, political, psychological, or feminist agendas within. Seemingly, it is this literalistically read Source which all the issues have in common.

Again, these broader conversations of these issues from the 1980’s also appear in the 1990’s. Yet by this time, and perhaps impacted by a previous 1982 pardoning of Hutchinson by Governor Michael Dukakis of the State of Massachusetts <sup>4</sup> the dialog begins incorporating another theme, the legal innocence or culpability of Hutchinson<sup>5</sup>.

---

These critics appearing alongside those like Kai T. Erikson (“Wayward Puritans”), and Patricia Caldwell “The Antinomian Language Controversy”) also emphasize the social dimensions of the trial. Yet questions which seek to discover how literalistic readings of the Bible influenced the procedures social and political nature of the Hutchinson’s Colony do not appear.

<sup>4</sup>Governor John Winthrop officially banished Anne Hutchinson in March 1638. Governor Dukakis repeal happened at least 350 years later in 1982.

<sup>5</sup> Jean Cameron in 1991 examines Hutchinson’s trials. Based on the papers of Thomas Hutchinson Governor of Massachusetts (great, great grandson of Anne and

This brings this discussion finally to our current twenty-first century. In 2008, Michael Kaufman claims in his article “Post-Secular Puritans: Recent Retrials of Anne Hutchinson” that the most recent comprehensive work published at the time of his publication was that of Emery Battis in 1981, *Thine Eyes Shall See Thy Teachers*. Then twenty-seven years old (and now today more than 35 years old!), Battis’ older critical read took a decidedly social science approach to Hutchinson’s history by choosing to focus mostly on Hutchinson’s manifested psychology during her trials. Then later the 2006 work of Lindal Buchanan, “A Study of Maternal Rhetoric: Anne Hutchinson, Monsters, and the Antinomian Controversy”, discusses the marginalizing rhetoric of the Colony inspired by Hutchinson’s malformed offspring. Here again, the Colony’s rhetoric about maternity, not its rhetoric influenced by a literalistic reading of the Bible, is the focus.

To summarize then, there seems to be no reference to the ways the use of a literalistically understood and agenda driven interpretation of the Bible created or influenced any of these issues just named. And since the author believes feminist, psychological, political, social, religious/theological agendas often shape, reveal, or flex themselves in the Colony through agendas driving the literalistic uses of Scripture, it seems that an analysis of this type is quite overdue.

---

William Hutchinson), Cameron concludes that the charges of sedition against Hutchinson were never proven to the satisfaction of the Bostoners (*Anne Hutchinson Guilty or Not?*). Yet once again, in Cameron’s work there is no emphasis on how a literalistic use of the Bible endorses and forms an invocative rhetoric.

Relatedly, as of 2016, if the relationship of the literalistic readings of Scripture in the rhetoric of Hutchinson, Cotton, and Winthrop has not been analyzed; then this means that the relationship of these readings to certain socio-political outcomes of their day has also not been analyzed, either. This means that the use of an authoritarian Bible to endorse, require and maintain 1.) the survival of the colony; or 2.) Hutchinson's excommunication has not been investigated either.

Additionally, while most critics praise Hutchinson as an ambassador for free thought, no one has sought to analyze her own use of Bible literalism to pave the way for free-thinking, and the thinking which frees. No one has sought to understand then, or to suggest ways of avoiding now what should have been avoided then in Hutchinson's day: the silencing of a thoughtful person by authorities in the name of a literalistic, authoritarian, understanding of the Bible.

So, in light of all of this, what is an analytical disposition/method one might use to view the ways in which Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson, apply the literalistic use of the Protestant Bible?

### **A Methodology for This Study**

Perhaps Americanist James Byrd's analytical approach to a similar phenomenon occurring in the sermons and writings of revolutionary America provides some direction. Byrd in his volume *Sacred Scripture. Sacred War* demonstrates how later Early American Revolutionary thinkers like Samuel Sherwood, and Thomas Paine rhetorically used Old and New Testament Texts to justify the Colony's war with Great Britain. For example in his work, Byrd "draws upon an analysis of over 17,000 biblical citations in over 500 sources from New England, the middle colonies, and the South" to point out

how the Texts cited most often were used “to inspire troops to fight for God and country” (*Sacred Scripture* 3). He says that:

although historians have known for years that the Bible was present in the American Revolution, his book reveals *how* it was present, and specifically how it was used to make the patriotic case for war. It, for the first time, provides an analysis of the biblical texts and themes that rose to the forefront as American patriots rose to the task of challenging the British Empire. This book is not only about the Bible and the American Revolution; it is also a book about the patriotic Bible *of* the American Revolution” (*Sacred Scripture* 3).

Like Byrd’s analysis, the researcher’s work is not only about the presence and general regard for the Bible by the 1637-1638 Puritans of the New England Boston Bay Colony, it is also about the theocratic and despotic use of their Bible in that Colony. This study like Byrd’s reveals *how* the Bible was present, and *how* it specifically was used to make or challenge the case for Hutchinson’s free thinking. Like Byrd’s work, this work provides the first analysis of the use of biblical texts and themes related to the increasing importance of free-thinking and inquiry in the Bible Commonwealth.

Just like Gordon Wood whom James Byrd references, the author believes the Bible had an inherent power in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The authorized interpreters, the clergy who translated the meaning of the ‘errand into the wilderness’ to most people, were successful because of their abilities to speak with arguments, stories, and images drawn from the Bible (*Sacred Scripture* 3). The use of Scripture in Hutchinson’s world was the primary way the powerful influenced those whom they ruled. Again, as referenced once earlier in this chapter, according to Christopher Hill’s work *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*, “Scripture was accepted as the ultimate authority on economics and politics no less than on religion and morals” (Hill 31).

Finally, the author reads the power struggles of Hutchinson, her followers, and the colonial leadership in specific ways. The researcher believes power as seen in these transcripts does not reside solely in an agent or its agency. Rather, power resides in and through all persons. It is pervasive, and the struggle for dominance and domination is never just one way. It is always mutual and shared.

This perspective of power as held by this researcher also helps explain the power issues and the struggles between Hutchinson and her judges. This means that the use of power and its associated struggles is not simply top down. It comes up from the bottom, too. Power is pervasive and available to all. Hutchinson in this view has as much power as the colonial leadership who judge and oust her.

While the exercise of power is certainly about the court's attempt to wield control over her free-thinking actions and influence; yet, it is also much more. Hutchinson fights for control over herself, too. She resists not just for, but also alongside other Antinomians. She, by using a literalistically read Bible rejects the will of her authoritarian leaders by appealing to their agenda-driven literalistic understandings of an Authoritarian Source, attempts to conform her thoughts and behaviors to those of their own.

In these transcripts, then, as regards the use of power, it also seems as if truth is not always absolute. The transcripts convey a sense of the struggle attached to a Puritan belief which says that truth has not been given once and for all. And this contributes majorly to the power struggle between Hutchinson and the court. The court/ leadership believes that *the truth* originates from above and is delivered to the Colony through them by means of a literalistically read source, the Bible. In fact, their interpretations and

Scripture actually seem to be one. This means that their interpretations, their ‘truth’, must be followed. Period.

Hutchinson, on the other hand, reads the Bible literalistically but for different reasons. Her literalistic readings are done democratically, communally, and non-despotically. She reads for a ‘truth’ found in the Bible, as something that is not the private property of the leadership. It does not only belong to them. Hutchinson perceives her insights about truth also originate from a higher authority, God himself. For her, God speaks His truth and laws not just to and through the authorities who challenge her, but also to and through her and her followers. She reads Scripture literalistically but with her own freeing agenda in mind; and as a result of these readings, individuals are empowered to create a reality which challenges an officially endorsed normative. In short, Hutchinson’s power makes available new ways of seeing and acting.

So then, as alluded to earlier, focusing *solely* on the power of the court to banish Hutchinson is less than productive. This approach makes her into a victim and nothing more. But to view and present Hutchinson as an empowered resistor; well, this allows her to be understood for who she truly was: an ambassador for free and freeing thought. This view of power allows Hutchinson to be much more than an eventual outcast. It enables her to be seen as an advocate for democracy in truth, and eventually truth in democracy.

To summarize the aforementioned, though the elders try Hutchinson by using the Bible to conceal their agendas and wield their despotic rule in authoritarian ways—and all in the name of God--; Hutchinson does the opposite. Also claiming Divine authority of a literalistically perceived Bible, her struggles with the powerful endorses thinking and actions which includes a democratic and more communal approach to Scripture. Using



the same approach to Bible reading as the court, Hutchinson is able to confront a Bible authoritarianism which favors the powerful.

As regards a methodology for reading these transcripts, the researcher also looks then for the ways the Bible is read, discussed, and invoked by Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson. This analysis consequently seeks to implicitly or explicitly answer these kinds of questions: 1.) Based on the literalistic hermeneutics of an authoritarian Bible and its resulting rhetoric appearing in sermons, books, pamphlets, and journals, what are some characteristic ways which Cotton and Winthrop read the Bible? 2.) What words and genres found in the Bible are used by Cotton, Winthrop, and Hutchinson? 3.) What happens when these words and genres from the Bible are literalistically interpreted by Hutchinson, Cotton, or Winthrop for their rhetorical purposes? 4.) How do their literalistic interpretations of Bible Text reflect and sponsor the social/political agendas and dialogs of each? And, finally, 5.) how are their social/political agendas communicated through a rhetoric which invokes the hearer/reader towards certain actions? Whether explicitly or implicitly stated, these five questions empower the researcher's analysis appearing in the upcoming chapters.

### **A Preview of This Study**

The basic pattern and contents of the upcoming chapters look like this.

*Chapter II.* This chapter examines representative sermons, letters, or journals of Cotton and Winthrop looking for the ways they literalistically read and refashion the word meanings of the Bible for the purposes of their agendas. Sometimes they also read typologically or allegorically to further illustrate their explicit or implied literalistic understandings and uses of the Bible. Isolating these significant patterns appearing in

selected works of Cotton and Winthrop also seen later in Hutchinson's transcripts, the author highlights at least seven emerging themes resulting from the hermeneutical/rhetorical practices seen there.

She shows, first, how Cotton and Winthrop use their literalistic Bible interpretations to privilege the collective not individual voices belonging to the community.

Secondly, and very much related to the first, the author illustrates how in some selected writings of Cotton and Winthrop, the love for God and others is defined as the people's unquestioned obedience to the Colony's rules and its rulers. She shows how love is defined civically. That is to say, love is the observance of rules and principles which insures the Colony's survival.

Thirdly, the author also shows how the literalistic use of the Bible in Winthrop and Cotton's writings sponsors their concept of an unconditional obedience to their leadership. She shows how they also require the Colony to live in ways that attract the admiration, and never the disdain of England.

This means then that, fifthly, citizens must therefore govern themselves according to the elder's literalistic understandings of the Bible. Those who refuse to do so are disobedient and risk certain Divine punishment.

Sixthly, the literalistic, typological, and allegorical transformations of Old Testament Texts in the works of Cotton also create a connection between literal Israel and a 'spiritual' Israel, the Massachusetts Bay Colony. In their writings, Cotton and Winthrop also identify the Colony with historical Israel with all the rights, privileges and responsibilities thereof. In light of this bond, Winthrop and Cotton believe that their

colonists must triumphantly fulfill a similar divine destiny. They have the Divine right and responsibility to subjugate the land, the Native inhabitants, and the wealth of all that is set before them.<sup>6</sup>

Seventhly, as pertaining to the allegories of the Bible which Winthrop and Cotton use, or the ways they re-allegorize Biblical allegories, all are related somehow to their own literalistically interpreted Bible Texts. Their allegories serve as charged images that illustrate or demand the actions and views they expect from their followers.

*Chapter III.* Building on Chapter II's analysis of Winthrop and Cotton's relevant primary sources, the seven resulting interpretive guides and the themes derived from them, are used to illuminate the literary contexts for the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic and ecclesiastical trials. Reading with these seven ideas in mind, the author explains *how* literalistic Bible meanings and derived calls for obedience are created by Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson. In a related way, she shows *how* these possible meanings are made and how the derivative resulting themes emerge.

In Chapter III, reading with these same interpretive guides in mind, the author analyzes the hermeneutics and rhetoric which can be seen in the transcripts of the November 1637 civic trials of Anne Hutchinson. Later in Chapter IV, she will do the same with regard to the ecclesiastical trials of March 1638.

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, Winthrop typologically transforms and rhetorically applies other Bible texts in *The Model of Christian Charity*. These texts reference the disobedience of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10:1-2); the destruction of God's enemy Amalek (I Samuel 15; 28:16-18); the breaching of the Covenant (Micah 6:8) are used to validate his views of God's claims and to so elicit his listener's response. He also makes use of similes (Matthew 5:13-16).

As a result of this hermeneutical and rhetorical analyses, the author shows how twelve derived themes/agendas appear in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic trials (March 16, 17 1637). For example, in their conversations with Hutchinson, Winthrop and Cotton use their literalistic Bible readings and their resulting rhetoric to justify their agendas for what constitutes their understanding of a healthy Colony. Their many expressed agendas logically fall under at least two major headings: 1.) the leadership's literalistic interpretation of the Bible; and 2.) the people's expected adherence to leadership's literalistic interpretation of the Bible.

Through their literalistic interpretation of the Bible, the leadership's expectations for those following them can be seen. Since true freedom results when all live by the rules found in the 'Rule Book', orthodox Bible interpretation is that activity which yields convergent never divergent truths. This means that the Colony's patriarchal leadership must be obeyed at all costs, at all times, by all people. This is because leadership is always right, and the reputations of appointed leaders are to be unquestioningly upheld by the people who follow them. Naturally, this comes to mean that the authoritarian teaching of the Church must be accepted and never questioned. In fact, open and honest questions and discussions about the teachings of the Church should always be avoided.

Finally, in Chapter III, the author shows many specific examples of the people's adherence to the agendas sponsored by the Court's literalistic reading of Scripture. For example, an ethically wrong practice is fully justified (e.g. Hutchinson's entrapment), if the supposed outcome is perceived as an ultimate good (e.g. Hutchinson's ouster). Using the words of Scripture to sanction such actions like these is acceptable, especially if it

serves the purpose of a supposed and necessary agenda which can be verified by one's reading of the Bible.

Again, the author shows how in an agenda laced literalistic reading of Scripture, a Christians' ultimate allegiance is to the Church/State, and not even to one's own family. She also shows how as regards Church leadership, Colony leaders use their literalistic readings to endorse their view which requires women to happily remain in their ecclesiastically established and gender specific roles. For example, if women are allowed to teach, then they must always teach under the protective and guiding umbrella of her husband.

In conclusion, then, these are the practical ways in which literalistically understood Bible texts are used by Cotton and Winthrop to subjugate a Colony and especially a free-thinking Hutchinson. But using the same methods as they, Hutchinson also employs her literalistically read Bible to resist them and to accomplish her differing purposes.

*Chapter IV.* Chapter IV demonstrates how once again the use of agendas drive the literalistic readings of the Bible and actually fuel the rhetoric of Hutchinson's ecclesiastical trials (March 1638). Particular attention is paid to Winthrop and Cotton and Hutchinson's dialog demonstrating how an agenda driven reading of a literalistic Bible finally results in her final banishment from the Colony. Part of a perennial pattern, the author shows how even after six months following her trial's conclusion, the literalistic uses of the Bible continue to be cited and used by the Colony's leaders to substantiate their continuing agendas for Hutchinson. Through their literalistic readings, Cotton and Winthrop continue to justify the supposed improvements which Hutchinson's departure

creates for their social order. Hutchinson, also through similar kinds of literalistic readings, continues to resist them.

*Chapter V.* The author concludes her analysis by describing some modern implications of Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson's interpretative and rhetorical uses of the Colony's Bible. After offering a perspective about their uses, the researcher offers how indeed their approaches are not anomalous. Indeed, their kind of interpretive and rhetorical moves are those of other seventeenth century American Puritan thinkers, too. Quite often in many other Puritan uses of Scripture, agendas motivate and fuel their interpretive processes as well. Agendas help justify a reader's foregone conclusion or planned actions. The author shows how some selected seventeenth century New England readings are very much like those readings of Winthrop and Cotton, and how commonly these readings of others in the seventeenth century Bible Commonwealth seem to support predetermined and often authoritarian agendas. So after a brief word about the similarities of other seventeenth century New England Bible readers, this work concludes briefly illustrating how similar patterns of literalistic Bible reading appear also in key moments of American history, both past and present: the American Revolution, slavery, global warming, gender issues in the church, and pastoral authority in the church. In light of all these uses, the author then proposes some interdisciplinary ways that Bible reading can be done. She ends her study, therefore, by offering her New Historicist readings as a model for other readers to follow, an exemplar which combines the insights of literary critical and Bible critical approaches.

## CHAPTER II

### WINTHROP AND COTTON'S INVOCATIVE USE OF THE BIBLE'S RHETORICAL POWER IN THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY WRITINGS

#### Introduction

Generally speaking, it is not unusual for Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritans during the period of the Antinomian Controversy to invoke the rhetorical power of the Protestant Old and New Testaments in their writings to specify and dictate certain courses of action. Their authoritarian, literalistic, dogmatic, directive allusions to Scripture-- what I choose to call the invocative use of the Bible's rhetorical power-- appear frequently in their works. The direct or indirect rhetorical use of Scripture, particularly by key speakers appearing in the transcripts of Anne Hutchinson's trial— Governor John Winthrop and Pastor John Cotton, especially —can also be seen in these almost contemporaneous Massachusetts Bay Colony journals, sermons, and letters.

In order to establish the general historical and literary context in which the transcripts of Hutchinson's civil and ecclesiastical trials appear, this second chapter surveys selected, representative occasions where the Bible is interpreted and then invocatively applied by John Winthrop in his *Model of Christian Charity*, *Journal*, letters, and *Short Story*. This chapter also shows how John Cotton does similarly in some of his selected sermons and other writings. These include *A Sermon Preached by the Reverend John Cotton a Retraction of His Former Opinion Concerning Baptism*; *God's*

*Promise to His Plantation*; and his *Twelve Fundamental Articles of Christian Religion*.

Later, in Chapter III and Chapter IV, the author shows how these same uses are employed by Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson, and how such appears in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civil and religious trials.

### **Approach, Definitions, and Use of the Terms 'Literal', 'Literalism', 'Allegorical', and 'Typological'**

The uses of Biblical Texts in literalistic, typological/anti-typological, and allegorical ways are quite common in the writings of Governor John Winthrop and Pastor John Cotton, as well as the words attributed to Anne Hutchinson by Winthrop in his *Journal and Story*.

Since this project involves not just Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson's readings of the Bible, but primarily the author's reading of their readings, she first offers some guiding definitions for terms and approaches my analysis employs. While the author works primarily and quite discernibly as a literary critic here, her work is also appropriately informed by her work as a Biblical studies scholar. Yet, she chooses in her work to resist the temptation to read the Bible text referenced in the transcripts as a Bible scholar might. This means that her focus is not on how Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson may have exegeted or eisegeted a specific ancient Text from an ancient past. This seems highly speculative, at best. Rather the author's focus here is how she generally sees them reading and using a Bible text; specifically, what she sees them doing with the Ancient Text in their then 1637 and 1638 present. The author's work, therefore, offers a reading of how together or separately Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson in their



mutual struggles for dominance use Bible texts to implicate or authenticate Divine approval for agendas they wish to achieve or resist.

The author, therefore, now offers guiding definitions for this kind of inter-disciplinary approach which both undergirds and guides the ways in which she proceeds. As regards the definition of literalistic readings of the Bible itself, she uses for this study the definition of Kevin Van Hoozer. For him 'literal readings' of Protestant Scripture differ from 'literalistic' readings of the same. For example, Van Hoozer in his book, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* provides an excellent working definition. First, he distinguishes literalistic from literal interpretation. He says that a literalistic reading "generates an unlettered, ultimately illiterate reading—one that is incapable of recognizing less obvious uses of language such as metaphor, satire, and so forth"(312). He also contrasts a literalistic method with a literal approach declaring that the distinction between the two methods relates to the ways readers tend to Scripture's words in a certain way. According to Van Hoozer, literalistic interpretation is like "a word-for-word translation that yields verbally exact or formally equivalent versions" of a given Bible Text. He believes a literalistic understanding, therefore, "runs the risk of overlooking the main point." In contrast, a "literal interpretation, on the other hand, is more like a translation that strives for dynamic equivalence and yields the literary sense" (312).

Van Hoozer, therefore makes a distinction between "empirically minded" [literalistic] interpreters who, in their zeal for factual correspondence, take an unimaginative, almost positivist, view of things", and "literate-minded" [or literal] readers who are sensitive to context and familiar with how literary texts work". According to him, these interpreters often allegorize discourse that could be taken

literally, or “[as literalists] ‘literalize’ discourse that is intended to be taken figuratively” (312). These features comprise the author’s definitions of ‘literalist’ and ‘literalistic’, and undergird her analysis of the way Bible Texts are used in the transcripts.

As will soon be seen, when Winthrop, Cotton and Hutchinson read the Bible as literalists, they often disregard the uses of the Bible’s language such as metaphor, or prophetic and poetic imagery. They often overlook a main point of a Text, or allegorize Texts which can also be taken literally; or perhaps, they literalize Biblical discourse which could also be read allegorically. Examples of these reader and rhetorical moves soon follow.

Additionally, the author’s work as a literary critic of English texts also requires she define ‘allegory’. She chooses to define ‘allegory’ like J.A. Cuddon in his *Dictionary of Literary Terms & Literary Theory*: “An allegory is a story or image with several layers of meaning: behind the literal or surface meanings are varying degrees of complexity” (21). Many allegories in the transcripts either directly or indirectly derive from Scripture. For example, there are some which derive directly from Old Testament Texts, like the story of Elijah (I Kings 21, II Kings 9). In this instances, John Winthrop allegorizes the use of the Bible name ‘Jezebel’ labeling Hutchinson as the great judged deceiver of the Colony (I Kings 21, II Kings 9: Revelation 2:20). In his version of events, John Winthrop also allegorically labels Hutchinson as the “Great American Jezebel” (*Short Story* 60).

However, some allegories indirectly reference a knowledge of the Bible. These allegories are simply figurative and descriptive uses of the English language indirectly derived from Bible texts. For example, Winthrop also labels Hutchinson as the Great Impostor, an Instrument of 64) Satan” (*Short Story* 64)—an allegorical creation of his

own not found in the Biblical text but one which reflects Biblical notions. The “Great Jezebel” and “the great impostor and instrument” are just three of the many kinds of allegorical labels which either directly derive or indirectly imply a Biblical source. These uses seem to be especially used during the highly emotive closure of the ecclesiastical trial just as Hutchinson is about to be banished from the Colony.

Furthermore, Protestant Bible interpreter Bernard Ramm also offers the author’s working definition for a Bible ‘allegory’ appearing in the transcripts. Ramm says of the interpretation of allegory in the Bible that it is “the interpretation of a document whereby something foreign, peculiar, or hidden is introduced into the meaning of [a Bible Text]” which purportedly gives it “a proposed deeper or real meaning” (*Protestant Bible Interpretation* 222-3) He quotes Allen Geffcen’s work “Allegory, Allegorical Interpretation,” appearing in Volume One of *Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* where Gefcen describes an “allegorical interpretation” as one which “an entirely foreign subjective meaning is read into the passage to be explained”( 328). In offering his definition, Ramm also quotes Edwin Clement Hoskyns and Francis Noel Davey’s definition from *The Riddle of the New Testament* which says that “allegory expresses the relationship between certain persons and things by substituting a whole range of persons or things from and entirely different sphere of experience” (Ramm 223).

This, therefore, is also the definition of Bible allegory which operates in this dissertation. Quite often Cotton, Winthrop (and later Hutchinson) read Scripture, see a Biblical allegory, and substitute a person or principle from their 1637-1638 world of experience to claim God’s sanction for a course of action for the others’ lives. They often invest their own foreign or peculiar meanings into the Bible Texts they read. They then

use these in their discussions as evidence for God's sanction for direction. For example, in John Winthrop's *Short Story* Hutchinson the thinker and communicator of new thoughts is allegorically described as a dog which has "returned to its vomit" (II Peter 2:22), and she is to be rightfully dismissed from Colony (64).

As for the definition of 'typology' or 'typological' interpretation with regards to the Bible, the author once again uses a classical definition by Protestant Bible interpreter Bernard Ramm. He says "typological interpretation is specifically the interpretation of the Old Testament based on the fundamental theological unity of the Old Testaments whereby something in Old shadows, prefigures, adumbrates something in the New [the Anti-Type]. Hence, what is interpreted in the Old is not foreign or peculiar or hidden, but rises naturally out of the text due to the relationship of the two Testaments" (*Protestant Bible Interpretation* 223). For example, Anne Hutchinson, especially during the closing moments of her ecclesiastical trial reads Scripture in a typological way. She does so to claim her life, sufferings, and rejection are also a prophesied fulfillment of Jeremiah 46, Isaiah 8, and Daniel 6. According to Winthrop's *Short Story*, Hutchinson claims she has been appointed by God to experience this very thing. She uses typological references to endorse how God's anointing is upon her, and that her accusers better be careful as to how they proceed with her case (*Short Story* 40).

These then are the definitions which inform the author's reading of the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic and ecclesiastical trials in the 1637-38 Boston Bay Colony. Winthrop, Cotton, and as will be seen later in Chapter III and IV even Hutchinson herself, often use Scripture in order to rhetorically require or rebuff the behaviors of each other. Through their use of literalistic, typological, or allegorical language—they invest

their meanings into specific Texts found within the Colony's Authoritarian Source. This provides them with a claimed Divine sanction which serves their intended outcomes.

The author, therefore, believes that a careful analysis of how these thinking and rhetorical processes work in the writings of Cotton/Winthrop provide readers with illuminative, literary, and historical contexts for approaching and understanding the transcripts of Anne Hutchinson's civil and ecclesiastical trials. These resulting enriched understandings can help modern readers of Hutchinson's transcripts grasp the sometimes opaque language and interpretive processes at work. As mentioned in Chapter I, knowing *how* and not just *what* Winthrop, Cotton, or later Hutchinson purportedly say goes a long way in clarifying not just the language, but also the issues and agendas motivating their rhetoric. Without a doubt, for many the Antinomian Controversy was primarily a crisis revolving around the authoritarian leadership of the Colony. Yet, perhaps on a deeper level, this crisis was just as much a defining moment about the limits and ways an authoritarian wielding of Scripture could be used to dictate belief and behaviors. The Bible became both the weapon and the battlefield in the struggles for dominance. Winthrop, Cotton and Hutchinson used the Bible in order to establish their own power, or to gain control over the other. Hutchinson rejected the will of her authoritarian leaders who, by appealing to their self- fashioned and literalistic understandings of an Authoritarian Source, attempted to conform her thoughts and behaviors to those of their own.

### **Winthrop and Cotton's Literalistic Uses of Biblical Texts**

To begin, then, many invocative appeals to ancient Bible Texts appear in John Winthrop's *Model of Christian Charity*. In this earliest and cardinal document of the

colony dated 1630, John Winthrop uses his literalistic understandings of certain Bible texts to establish what governance in the Bay Colony will be for his *Arbella* passengers. His sermon “written on board the *Arbella*, on the Atlantic Ocean” (*Model of Christian Charity*) is full of direct or indirect rhetorical allusions to the Bible which he signally uses to promote his agendas. Indeed, there are very few occasions in this sermon when a literalistic interpretation and application of Scripture to his colonists’ lives is NOT used.

*The Bible is a ‘Rule Book’ Which Must Be Obeyed.* For Governor Winthrop, the Bible seems to be a book which is quite often literalistically interpreted and applied to the rules, the ruled, and the ruling of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. For example, in the *Model of Christian Charity* he begins by enjoining the obedience of his followers based upon the “the practice of mercy according to the rule of God's law”. At the very beginning of this venture, “God’s law” deriving from the Protestant Bible is upheld as the rule book by which all should conduct themselves. Winthrop’s regard for the voyager’s recognition of and affection for the Bible as an ultimate code of law is primary. He views such a commitment and “affection” for the Bible’s “commandment” as that which alone can inspire the Colony’s “exercise of mercy” (*A Model of Christian Charity* 2). He demonstrates this at the beginning of his homily by reading literalistically.

Since the Bible is read as a ‘Rule Book’ by Winthrop, he naturally connects his commandment” with four rules: the “rule” of “giving, lending, and forgiving” (36-38); and the “rule of the community of peril” (38). In each case, Winthrop ignore the genres out of which all four rules derive. Consider, for example, the rules of “giving, lending, and forgiving”. Winthrop’s derived “rule of giving” ignores its ancient home within the

genres of wisdom literature<sup>7</sup>, the narrative of the Pentateuch<sup>8</sup>, and the New Testament genre of gospel<sup>9</sup> (36-37)<sup>10</sup>. His “rule of lending” ignores his selected verses roots within the genres of the Pentateuch’s narrative<sup>11</sup>, and again the New Testament genre of gospel<sup>12</sup> (38). His derived “rule of forgiving” also ignores the genres of narrative found in the Pentateuch’s Old Testament Texts<sup>13</sup>, or the New Testament genre of gospel.<sup>14</sup> In all of these examples, Winthrop reads literalistically seeking only the rules by which he will govern the colonists whom he expects will follow him.

After all, Winthrop is a leader of these voyagers. The *Model of Christian Charity* both begins and ends with this allusion. In the opening inscription John Winthrop is described as a “brave Leader and Famous Governor” of “Christian tribes”. He is celebrated in the title words of his homily as someone who led “a great company of religious people” from “Great Brittain to New-England in the North America” in the year 1630 (*Model of Christian Charity* 33). Throughout his homily he speaks as a great moral and ethical leader, and at the very end he even concludes with a Mosaic like voice. He tells his listeners:

***I shall shut up this discourse with that exhortation of Moses, that faithful servant of the Lord, in his last farewell to Israel, Deut. 30*** [italics mine]. *Beloved there is now set before us life and good, Death and evil, in that we are commanded this day to love the Lord our God, and to love one another, to walk in his ways and to keep his Commandments and his Ordinance and his laws, and the articles of our Covenant with him, that we may live and be multiplied, and that the*

---

<sup>7</sup> Ecclesiastes 11:1

<sup>8</sup> Genesis 47:13-27

<sup>9</sup> Matthew 16:19

<sup>10</sup> I Corinthians 6:2; I Timothy 5:8;

<sup>11</sup> Deuteronomy 15:7

<sup>12</sup> Matthew 5:42

<sup>13</sup> Deuteronomy 15:2

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 7:22

*Lord our God may bless us in the land whither we go to possess it. But if our hearts shall turn away, so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced, and worship and serve other Gods, our pleasure and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither we pass over this vast sea to possess it; Therefore let us choose life that we, and our seed may live, by obeying His voice and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and our prosperity. (Model of Christian Charity 47-8)*

With these words, and very reminiscent of the first Moses' final address to the Israelites before they entered their promised land (Deuteronomy 31), Winthrop concludes his inaugural address and reminds his voyaging Faithful of their responsibility to also "love life" in direct obedience to Deuteronomy 31 (*Model of Christian Charity*, 47-8). To not obey the rules is disobedience. This is because according to Winthrop's read, God requires the strict observance of the rules by His people.

Winthrop also specifically reminds his *Arbella* voyagers that: "When God gives a special commission he looks to have it strictly observed in every article" (*Model of Christian Charity* 46). He illustrates his point with an example of Saul. Because Saul did not take seriously the rule to destroy Amalek's claims "he failed" and this "lost him the kingdom, which should have been his reward, if he had observed his commission". For Winthrop, "this [literalistic obedience to God's commands] stands [as] the cause [of our relationship] between God and us" (*Model of Christian Charity* 46). Of this connection he says:

We are entered into Covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a commission. The Lord hath given us leave to draw our own articles. We have professed to enterprise these and those accounts, upon these and those ends. We have hereupon besought Him of favor and blessing... ***but if we shall neglect the observation of these articles*** [italics mine]...the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us; be revenged of such a [sinful] people and make us know the price of the breach of such a covenant. (*Model of Christian Charity* 46)



Generally speaking, then, through communicating his literalistic understandings and uses of certain Bible passages like the above, Winthrop with a Mosaic force establishes how passengers will be governed in their new land. He does this particularly by citing Bible passages originating from the ancient Law book of Old Testament-- the Book of Deuteronomy—the inspired Source which governed theocratic Israel. He obligates his followers to obey to him by requiring the “the practice of mercy *according to the rule* of God's law (italics mine)”. For Winthrop, it is the literalistic following of “the commandment”, and “affection” for the same “from which this exercise of mercy must arise” (*Model of Christian Charity* 46).

*The Bible Literalistically Read Requires that All Colonists Love Each Other In Their Civic Lives.* In his *Model of Christian Charity*, presuming his rhetorical moment as a decidedly Protestant Christian one, Winthrop assumes all colonists on board the *Arbella* to be “fellow members of Christ”. He then charges them to live with the motivation of Christian love. He again supposes his audience to be a “company professing themselves as fellow members of Christ”; and therefore, they like himself, must “account [themselves] knit together by this bond of Love and live in the exercise of it.” This is essential if all these assumed Believers are to “have comfort of ... being in Christ” (*Model of Christian Charity* 46).

But exactly what is this “bond of love” to which Winthrop commits them all? Just a few lines later in the same sermon, Winthrop cites a New Testament poem presented by Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (I Corinthians 13). Paul’s words are indeed poetic about loving expressions of spiritual gifts of the Corinthians within the context of their small church located in Greece. The Spirit’s gifts intertwine with love. As Paul says:

“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal” (I Corinthians 13:1).

Yet, Winthrop reading here as a literalist ignores the poetic genre in search of a governing rule. In the same context where Winthrop speaks about mutual love being necessary for the Colonists, he connects it not just to ecclesiastical expression, but also to civil responsibility. In his homily, Winthrop broadens love.

It is by a mutual consent, through a special overvaluing providence and a more than an ordinary approbation of the Churches of Christ, to seek out a place of cohabitation and Consortship under a due form of Government both civil and ecclesiastical. (*Model of Christian Charity* 45)

Adapting Paul’s words about spiritual gifts, Winthrop also promotes his colonizing work: “the work we have at hand”. For Winthrop I Corinthians 13 connects itself to a concern for the public which “oversway[s] all private respects”. Such a love means that “not only conscience, but mere civil policy, doth bind us” (*Model of Christian Charity* 45). According to Winthrop’s read of I Corinthians, love in the colony is a “true rule for the public” (*Model of Christian Charity* 46). Based on a literalistic use of Pauls’ words found in I Corinthians 13, Winthrop rhetorically invokes his Colony to do their civic duty of love. And their civic obligations will not allow any idea or activity or attitude leading to the “ruin of the public” (*Model of Christian Charity* 46).

*The Bible Read Literalistically Requires a Set of Moral Goals for The Colony.*

Winthrop in his homily also introduces the goal of his passengers’ relocation within their new land. To do this he actually alters the words of another New Testament text located in the Epistle to the Philippians 2:12:

Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, *work out your own salvation* [italics mine] with fear and trembling.

From this New Testament letter written by Paul during his house confinement, Winthrop selects the words “working out *your own salvation* (italics mine)” to rhetorically appeal to his colonists’ sense of civic duty. In literalistic fashion as previously defined by Van Hoozer, Winthrop ignores the genre of the verse. These words actually comprise a conclusion to a Christocentric hymn and creed found in the context before it<sup>15</sup> (Philippians 2:1-11). Instead, Winthrop uses Paul’s words as a rhetorical empowering moment opportunity to establish his own authority and appeal. He uses it to require his followers’ obedience to the Colony’s laws.

And in a bold interpretive move, he even changes the wording of the original personal pronouns occurring in the Pauline Text. Instead of allowing the second person plural of Paul’s command to stand--“work out *your* salvation” (italics mine)--, Winthrop changes it to a first person plural “work out *our* salvation” (italics mine). Refashioning the phrase to both conform to and reflect his agenda, “working out of our salvation” becomes something totally different. No longer is this Text about a freely willed Christian self-renunciation benefitting others in a local church. Rather, based on the local context in Winthrop’s sermon where it appears, the phrase “working out of our salvation” comes to mean “*improving our lives* to do more service to the Lord” (italics mine).

---

<sup>15</sup>The significance of this genre and “Christ Hymn” is discussed by Ralph P Martin in his important work, *Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997.

Additionally, within the context of his sermon, Winthrop also associates the notion of an outworked salvation with this idea: “... *that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world* to serve the Lord” (italics mine). He also aligns his definition of outworked salvation with “the power and purity of (God’s) holy ordinances” which is most likely a reference to the authoritarian laws of the Colony, those rules undoubtedly deriving from a Puritan interpretation and application of the Biblical Law (*Model of Christian Charity* 45).

In the end, through his rhetoric Winthrop replaces Paul’s ancient, horizontal, mutual, freely offered, self-renunciation among equals with his own obligatory, top down, yet unified coalition in the New World. He clearly demands a different kind of salvation among the colonists than the Philippians text might imply. Salvation, or a right relationship with God, will on this new continent reveal itself as an expected, all-inclusive, obedience to the rules. Winthrop’s salvation will be outworked not by motives of self-renunciation, but rather self-preservation: “*that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world* to serve the Lord” (italics mine)” (*Model of Christian Charity* 10).

*The Bible Read Literalistically Requires the Colony to Live Better Lives Than They Did in England and So Avoid England’s Disdain.* Next, Winthrop fourthly directs his listeners to the activities by which their errand in the new world will be accomplished. Like other Puritan sermons of his day, he indirectly or directly quotes Bible Texts, and such Texts appear right next to or not far away from his stated agenda(s). For example, in Winthrop’s *Model of Christian Charity*, he typically does the same. Just like beads on a string, this thought process both connects and blend the agendas and their Source of

Authority in ways that create some new sort of command. The overall result of this for Winthrop is that his plans for his Colony get promoted.

For example, Winthrop perceives the colonizing task in New England as “extraordinary”, one which disallows any of his *Arbella* passengers to “content themselves with ordinary means” (*Model of Christian Charity* 45). He insists that none of those accompanying him are to regard “whatsoever we did or ought to have done when we lived in England” as a guiding paradigm. Instead, the voyagers must continue to do what they did back home, yet with one more important qualification: “The same must we do... and [the] more also...” The spirituality of his listeners must exceed their experiences in their former English church, one which made “a truth in profession only” (*Model of Christian Charity* 45). Assuming that all on board are devout Christians, he says “[Their] familiar and constant practice...”, their “duty of love”..., must be in the words of Romans 12:9 that which is “brotherly... and without dissimulation”. In the words of I Peter 1:22, the Community must “love one another with a pure heart fervently” (*A Model of Christian Charity* 46).

If they are to excel in their mission, Winthrop insists they must “bear one anothers’ burdens” (Galatians 6:2). Here Paul’s words in his occasional letter refers simply to forgiveness among church members in a small local church located in the Province of Galatia. Yet Winthrop reads and rhetorically uses this forgiveness Text to speak not of this kind of relational and spiritual caring, but rather a meaning which can only be appreciated materialistically. In the context of his homily, Winthrop reads and uses Galatians 6:2 to invoke his audience’s obedience in the New World: “We must not

look only on *our own things*, but also on the *things of our brethren*” (italics mine) (*Model of Christian Charity* 46) .

This also means that the Bible read literalistically also requires that the Colony avoid at all costs the disdain of England. Winthrop also reads and uses for his rhetorical purposes the mid 60’s AD words of the Apostle Peter which applaud simplicity in the daily lives of Christians. In his homily, Winthrop references this Petrine verse which reads: “For he that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile” (I Peter 3:10). Winthrop uses these words in order to remind his new Israelites of their responsibility to “love life” in the ways he has just described (*A Model of Christian Charity* 45). He rhetorically equates and demands a new goal among his voyagers. In obedience to their new Moses figure, they are to “love life” not in the Petrine ways of Christian simplicity, but in ways which attract the admiration and never the disdain of England (*A Model of Christian Charity* 46). According to Winthrop’s read and use of this Text, the Colony’s unsuccessful mission accompanied by a failure to “love life” as he has set it before them is potential loss of face. Or more?

*The Bible Read Literalistically Requires the Colony to Follow the Rules and Principles of the Bible EXACTLY.* Winthrop’s literalistic transformations and resultant rhetorical invocations can also be seen four years later. In a two paged “Letter to Nathaniel Rich”, an early autographed letter signed May 22, 1634, Winthrop cites a much disparaged, forbidden census which King David conducted in Israel (I Chronicles 21: 1; II Samuel 24:1). In his letter to Rich, Winthrop acknowledges how some “Protestants” of his day might also look badly on with census taking in light of David’s divinely condemned practice. Accounting for how he has been governing his Colony, Winthrop

describes the growing population to Rich. Then Winthrop goes to great lengths in assuring him, that he has NOT undertaken a census. Instead, he insists that his numbers are mere *estimates* of the Colony's population. His numberings are not the result of any scripturally forbidden practice. To Rich he says:

you may please therefore to understand that first, for the number of our people, ***we never took any survey of them, nor do we intend it,*** except enforced through urgent occasion (David's example sticks somewhat with us) [***some Protestants interpreted the Bible as forbidding a census***] (italics mine) but I esteem them to be in all about 4000 souls and upward: in good health (for the most parse) and well provided of all necessarys. (Gilder Lehrman Collection)

The Biblical passages to which Winthrop refers here are I Chronicles 21: 1 and II Samuel 24:1. In these historical narratives related to Israel's kingdom history, the theological reasons which motivated David to undertake a census of his kingdom's population are told. In essence, David's census was situationally motivated by a lack of trust in Jehovah. Winthrop reads it differently, however. The historical occasion and reason motivating David's census as seen in this genre of historical narrative appear not to be important for Winthrop's read. Rather, he recasts the narrative, and from his reading he creates an iron clad rule which prohibits all census taking. For Winthrop, seemingly, if taking a census was wrong once, it must be wrong forever. Counting a population is Biblically a sign of a lack of trust in God. For Winthrop and his Colony this perception must be avoided by all means.

Again in this same letter, in order to assure other readers of the general success of His colony, Governor Winthrop refers indirectly not directly to practices of Church polity. His policies seem to be most logically derived from New Testament passages like the occasional epistle of Ephesians chapter four; or Luke's narrative the Acts of the

Apostles; or, perhaps the occasional Pastoral Epistles. In these Biblical contexts, ancient rules for ecclesiastical governance appear. Given Winthrop's desire for his colony to be perceived by all as one which follows the rules of the Bible pertaining to the life of the Church, Winthrop indirectly alludes to New Testament Texts like these already mentioned. He reports:

Our Churches are *governed by Pastors, Teachers ruling Elders and Deacons, yet the power lies in the whole Congregation* (italics mine) and not in the Presbytery [not in a larger council of churches]...than for order and precedence. (Gilder Lehrman Collection)

Specifically referring to titles of leadership located within the New Testament -- "Pastors" and "Teachers" and "ruling Elders and Deacons" and the "whole congregation"--; Winthrop endorses a congregational form of Church government. Perhaps in contrast, he possibly has other forms of church governance in mind which includes archbishop, bishops and popes. Regardless, though, of any possible specific references, Winthrop makes it clear that as a rule the Colony's churches must be governed according to the exact patterns seen in the New Testament. "The power lies in the whole Congregation" (Gilder Lehrman Collection). Seemingly, though, there are limits for this "power of the whole congregation". As will be seen later in Chapter Four, the "whole congregation" had very little free opportunity to challenge Hutchinson's excommunication verdict.

*The Bible Read Literalistically Requires the Colony to View the Roles of Women in Certain Ways.* Not only does Winthrop use the Bible in literalistic ways, John Cotton, Anne Hutchinson's pastor from Alford, England now serving in Boston Colony also does the same. According to one of his early theological writings *The Twelve Treatise of*



*Faith...* published after his death in 1713, the Colony's male ministry makes no place for women unless they be widows who can be appointed as "deaconesses" to support the social needs of the congregation (23). While women can serve the practical, physical, social needs of the church and community. Cotton's literalistic reading of two of Pauls' occasional letters (Romans 12:8<sup>16</sup>, and First Epistle of Timothy 5:9<sup>17</sup>) makes a case that only men can serve the church theologically. He reads in order to establish his general agenda of limiting female influence in the Church. He uses the words of I Timothy 5:9 which speaks specifically about the care of widows, and uses the same words to support a supposed female diaconate. He then rhetorically invokes his reader to make sure that females in service to the Church conform to these standards:

Ancient women who are 60 years old, well reported for good works, nurturing their children, and lodging strangers, washing the saints feet, for relieving the afflicted, and following diligently every good work I Tim 5:9, 10 Rom 6 (*Twelve Treatise of Faith* 23).

In Cotton's view, colony women serve the physical needs of others and have to be sixty years old to do so! While nothing is said here about women's right to teach, and to teach men especially; later, in John Winthrop's version of the transcripts of Hutchinson's civil trial (*Short Story* 36), he says that women are forbidden to teach based on a literalistically read Text of I Timothy 2:12-15( *Short Story* 36)<sup>18</sup>. Based on the evidence

---

<sup>16</sup> Romans 12:8 reads: "Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness."

<sup>17</sup> I Timothy 5:9-10 reads: "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man. Well reported for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work."

<sup>18</sup> I Timothy 2; 12-15 reads "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was

both here and in the transcripts, it seems safe to assume that women are to be subject to male leadership in all things ministerial; and as will be seen later, this becomes a big issue for Anne Hutchinson.

Her literalistically understood Bible requires for her a certain allotted place in the Church. Again, according to John Winthrop's *Journal*, Anne Hutchinson's refusal to abide in her socially allotted place in the Colony is also perceived as challenging an already accepted read of Scripture regarding a woman's role in the Church. Says Winthrop:

Mo. 7 [September] The Last day of the Assembly other questions were debated and resolved—1. That though women might meet (some few together) to pray and edify one another, yet such a set assembly (as was then in practice at Boston) where sixty or more did meet every week, *and one woman (in a prophetic way, by resolving questions of doctrine and expounding scripture) took upon her the whole exercise, was agreed to be disorderly and without rule* (italics mine). 2. Though a private member might ask a question publicly after the sermon, for information, yet this ought to be very wisely and sparingly done, *and that with leave of the elders* (italics mine): but *questions of reference (then in use), whereby the doctrines delivered were reprov'd and the elders reproach'd, and that with bitterness, etc., was utterly condemn'd* (italics mine). (*Journal* 130)

Reading Bible Texts literalistically, Winthrop cannot abide Hutchinson's practice of "resolving questions of doctrine and expounding Scripture". Though he considers it acceptable for a few women to meet together in order to "to pray and edify one another...", yet he views "sixty or more" meeting... every week" and "one woman" teaching and challenging the doctrines of the Clergy as inappropriate. During

---

not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.<sup>15</sup> Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

Hutchinson's civic trial he will cite Titus 2:1-6<sup>19</sup>; I Timothy 1:12<sup>20</sup> as proofs forbidding this activity.

And when it comes to her life in the home, a literalistically read Bible requires a woman to submit to her husband. Winthrop, in yet another place of his *Journal*, expresses a related concern about Hutchinson's perceived lack of submission to her husband. She is simply not as submissive as she ought to be. In fact, it seems to him as if Hutchinson is leading her man, rather than being led by him. Winthrop views "Mr. William Hutchinson. [as] a man of a very mild temper and weak parts, [who is] *wholly guided by his wife*, (italics mine) [this Anne Hutchinson] who had been the beginner of all the former troubles in the country, and [who still] still continues to be [a] disturbance" (*Journal* 156)

Though not specifically referencing a Pauline Passage about women and Church governance, or the role of women as teachers who violate their submissive relationship to their husbands and other men; there is a striking parallel between Winthrop's words and the First Epistle to the Corinthians (12:34-36). It is probable that Winthrop might be indirectly referencing a value inspired by a literalistic reading of the Epistle to the Corinthians 14:34-36. It reads:

---

<sup>19</sup> Titus 2:1-6 reads: "But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine: That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience. The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Young men likewise exhort to be sober minded."

<sup>20</sup> I Timothy 2:12 reads: "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence"

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

If this is the case as the author believes, it means that Winthrop is again indirectly using a literalistic way of reading a New Testament Epistle, a New Testament 'occasional' genre which by its very nature offers directives on a case by case basis. Ignoring how the Epistle's words are indeed written in response to a specific need in a specific place and time, Winthrop uses them to leverage control over one woman publicly expressing her theological and Biblical insights to others. For him, Hutchinson is clearly violating the ecclesiastical limitations placed on her by gender specific role allowed to her by the colony, and she must be stopped.

And this is not just the hermeneutic of John Winthrop, it is that of John Cotton.

This is confirmed in his sermon on *The Twelve Fundamentals of Religion*. Based on a similar literalistic transformation of an occasional Epistle (I Corinthians 12:34-36), Cotton rhetorically insists that women are allowed to quietly ask questions of their pastors (I Corinthians 12:21-23).

*The Bible Read Literalistically also Requires the Colony to Punish Wrongdoers. Harshly.* Furthermore, it also seems that sometimes literalistic readings of Scripture sponsored the makings for a harsh society. For example, in one of many sections of Winthrop's *Journal* describing Hutchinson's trial, and the participants in the Antinomian Controversy she helped lead, Winthrop records how a one-time proposed literalistic use of "Cotton's Old Testament Capital Code", never came to a vote. 'Thankfully!

Apparently, during a certain juncture of Anne Hutchinson's trial, Cotton reading a chosen Scripture passage literalistically, supported a measure which if implemented would have "prescribed the death penalty for profanation of the Sabbath and reviling magistracy as well as for fornication, incest, sodomy, and buggery"<sup>21</sup>. Winthrop records how it was decided that this measure would "not be taken into further consideration until the next general court (*Journal* 106).

It never came to a vote at that particular time, but had it done so the author is left with three reflections. She believes this proposed literalistic reading of the Old Testament's capital punishment code was intended to subjugate the free-thinking Antinomians who challenged the colony's leadership. Specifically, the author believes that the "prescribed death penalty for reviling magistracy", actually known as "Cotton's Old Testament Law Code", may have been motivated by the specific desire to control the dissension of the eventually banished three--Hutchinson, Wheelwright, and Aspinwall. The author believes Cotton might possibly have had in mind the other soon disenfranchised eight: Coggeshall, John Underhill, William Balston, Edward Hutchinson, Thomas Marshall, Richard Gridley, William Dinely, and William Dyer (footnote 31, *Journal*). And most importantly, she believes that if this measure had passed, Hutchinson and her followers already accused of heresy/sedition would have been corporeally punished for "reviling [the] magistracy" (*Journal* 106).

---

<sup>21</sup> Although it cannot be proven beyond the shadow of a doubt, I am confident that Cotton probably has these kinds of capital punishment laws of the theocratic kingdom of Israel in mind: Exodus 22:19; 31:14,15; 35:2; Leviticus 18:22; 20:11, 12, 14, 15, 16; 20:31.

The author believes that this literalistic use of Scripture signals the desperate desire of the elders to control, and to stop the free-thinking and discussions associated with the Antinomian Controversy. Most certainly, if she is correct, this speaks of the depths of evil a revered Cotton would have been willing to go to maintain that control. If the writer is correct, this also speaks about the ways Cotton is willing to use his Biblical sources to achieve his purposes, and this will be seen close up in the civic and ecclesiastical trials.

Perhaps he consciously does this. Maybe he thinks that desperate times call for desperate measures, and that he is not culpable for the potential deaths of others. Maybe he thinks that in fact he has Divine sanction in trying to accomplish a greater good. Maybe this greater good is that of sparing the Colony greater evils associated with the Antinomian Controversy. Perhaps for Cotton capital punishment is not an evil, but actually a divinely approved Old Testament practice which guarantees the eventual betterment of his society by ridding it of miscreants.

While the author's speculations about this situation can never be truly proven, Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle do claim in their *Abridged Edition* of Winthrop's *Journal* that while Cotton's Code did not get adopted in Massachusetts, it did eventually "suppl[y] the framework for the legal code of the New Haven Colony" (footnote 69, *Journal* 107).

*The Bible Read Literalistically With Uniformity of Belief As Its Goal Supports The Stability of the Colony.* Also in relationship to a woman's teaching role, Winthrop in his *Journal* expresses his displeasure. Hutchinson and others are reading literalistically with

results which often differ from Winthrop's readings. The lack of literalistic readings which agree with his are responsible for the Antinomian heresies in the Colony. He says:

Upon occasion of the censures of the court upon Mrs. Hutchinson and others, divers other foul errors were discovered which had been secretly carried away by way of inquiry but after were maintained by Mrs. Hutchinson and others; and so many of Boston were tainted with them, Some of the secret opinions were these:-- That there is no inherent righteousness in a child of God. *That neither absolute nor conditional promises belong to a Christian. That we are not bound to the law, not as a rule etc.* (italics mine) That the Sabbath is as other days. That the soul is mortal until it be united with Christ, and then it is annihilated and the body also and a new given by Christ. That there is no resurrection of the body. (*Journal* 135)

Winthrop's literalistic reading and application of Scripture, seem to contrast with the literalistic ways Hutchinson and her cadres also read and respond to the Bible.

Winthrop, through his literalistic readings obviously believes the direct opposite of what he is accusing an also literalistic reading Hutchinson of believing. He supports the Bible as a 'Rule Book' for the Colony. Yet, in comparison to Hutchinson who is also a literalist, Winthrop seems to read as a 'literalist's literalist'. In fact, He disparages Hutchinson for her type of literalism which strangely he perceives as less literal than his. As such, her beliefs and behaviors have profound potential to spawn social upheaval in his colony. If, during her civic trial, Hutchinson believes what she is accused of here; specifically that citizens are not bound to the same literalistic readings of Old Testament Law of the leaders upon which all other civic laws are founded, then what is left to motivate citizens to follow any law—theological or civic?

In contrast, it can also be safely supposed in this black and white society that Winthrop reading as a literalistic interpreter believes the exact opposite of Hutchinson. For example, he believes that there IS an actual "inherent righteousness in a child of

God”; that there ARE real and “absolute and conditional promises belonging to a Christian”; that the Colony IS literalistically “bound to the Law, as a rule, etc.; that the “Sabbath” literalistically IS NOT “as other days”; that “the soul” IS NOT actually “mortal until it be united with Christ”, and that the soul and body ARE NOT really “annihilated”, and that there WILL BE a new body to be given by Christ (*Journal* 135)

Certainly, some of these contrasts read as mere theological minutiae to a 21st century mind. Yet, the author believes that bubbling beneath all these seeming trivial issues are the real questions being raised. At a deeper level, Winthrop and Cotton are asking these kinds of questions: ‘What would happen in this colony if a preference for a literalistic readings of Scripture differing from our own became an acceptable practice for all? If the Governor’s literalistic reading of Scripture grants him the authority to dictate the beliefs and actions of the governed, what happens if different ways of reading Scripture unlike his are also allowed to co-exist? Do the people begin living as they please? What happens if Hutchinson and others choose to utilize a literalistic interpretive approach to the Biblical Text but one which produces different viewpoints, even for just one of these listed issues? What becomes of the stability of social order? Is anarchy just around the corner?

Furthermore, if the Colony believes that civic righteousness can only be demonstrated by abiding by the biblically inspired laws of the colony, then there are implications of Hutchinson’s belief which says “that there is no inherent righteousness in a child of God” (*Journal* 135). If she initially claims this, then this belief lessens the requirements for Citizens to live in noble ways as defined by the Colony’s leadership. If persons lack an innate ability to both do and be righteous, then will they even try to live



up to their leader's expectations? Freely living as a fully functioning libertine becomes the only other logical option. And this, in the minds of the Winthrop and Cotton leads not just to anarchy, but perhaps even worse, *their* loss of control and prestige.

Again, if as Hutchinson believes "that neither absolute nor conditional promises belong to a Christian..." (*Journal* 135); then this also means God has not communicated specific courses of action by which humans can be expected to know and obey. This means that Divine and governmental rewards for obeying absolute laws and standards do not exist, at least theologically. This means in this situation that colonists become free to think and live their own lives according to their own belief systems, if there are any. Citizens are in no way bound to live as their leaders dictate. In essence, if there are not certain and required absolute or conditional promises to fulfill, this means that Colony Christians must use their own minds to determine good beliefs and actions both for themselves and others. And this for Winthrop and Cotton is dangerous.

If as Hutchinson believes "that we are not bound to the law, not as a rule etc."; then this lessens the obligation for citizens to honor the colony's laws which derive their authority from the Old Testament Law, or in a protestant Christian view, its fuller and expression in the New Testament. If the Biblical/theological Law is not a rule, then neither are the civic laws which they inspire. Weaken the theological foundations, and this Bay Colony house is in grave danger of collapse.

Again, if as Hutchinson believes "that the Sabbath is as other days," and the command to observe the Sabbath is the fourth commandment appearing in the Bible's Decalogue, then her belief not only dilutes the influence of the Old Testament, it actually renders it void. Furthermore, no observance of the Sabbath potentially leads to no church

attendance. No church attendance leads to a loosening control of the leadership over worshippers composing the colony. No control by leaders of these persons means an increasingly antinomian society. Once again, if as feared, society becomes increasingly unruly it will become unruly. Biblically inspired laws like this one will be set aside. People will live according to their own convictions, and both the dictates of the laws and their enforcers to control the population. This lack of heeded authority will lead to the dissolution of society, and the failure of this ‘errand in the wilderness’ will lead finally to England’s disapproval and wrath.

Finally in this regard, if as Hutchinson believes, “that the soul is mortal til it be united with Christ, and then it is annihilated and the body also and a new given by Christ”; and, if as she believes “that there is no resurrection of the body (*Journal* 135)...then for Hutchinson, Christ has the ultimate power over a Christian human being and not the present leadership. If Christ is the one who resurrects the body, then He and not the Puritan leadership has the final word not just in death but in life situations. Christ has the real definitive and final power over leaders and not just their followers. This means, then, that the leaders of the colony are not nearly as powerful as they themselves would like to suppose.

So it is because of this reasoning that Winthrop expresses his displeasure. He fears his literalistic hermeneutics will be replaced by Hutchinson’s literalistic hermeneutics. This undermines his despotic rhetoric and gives the Antinomians the opportunity to vie for and win power over him and for themselves. If He, as well as Cotton fear the potential dissolution of life and prestige they have come to enjoy; then

Hutchinson also fears the loss of a potential freedom for herself and her followers which she and they insist on knowing. And this is cause of the struggle.

*Summary of The Literalistic and Rhetorically Invocative Use of Scripture in Cotton's and Winthrop's Writings.* Generally speaking, there seems to be a pattern in the ways the meanings of Bible Texts are literalistically transformed and rhetorically invoked in the works of Cotton and Winthrop. These specific patterns in the representative works selected for this study provide a literary context for understanding the ways the Bible is used to forward the authoritarian agendas of both Cotton and Winthrop in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic and religious trials. Understanding *how* these meanings are made become keys to understanding *what* meanings might be present.

To summarize these, as well as to introduce their explicit or implicit use in the next chapter, the author would like to briefly summarize how the literalistic uses of Bible Texts result in certain types of rhetorical invocations. These are at least eight in number. As already seen:

1. When read literalistically, the Bible is a 'Rule Book' which must be observed. Love in the Colony operates as a 'true rule for the public'. According to Winthrop, all citizens are to allow nothing which leads to the "ruin of the public" (*Model of Christian Charity* 9).

2. A literalistically read Bible requires that all Colonists love each other in their civic lives. The Colony is expected to demonstrate its love in the new world. Love is primarily an obedience to the rules and its rulers. According to Winthrop, love is always motivated by that which insures the Colony's self-preservation (*Model of Christian Charity* 45).

3. A literalistically read Bible requires a set of moral goals for the Colony.

According to Winthrop, it is expected that Colonists will be known for “loving life”. This means that a new goal exists among newcomers. They are to give themselves to the “working out of [their] salvation”, improving their lives so that they can “do more service to the Lord. They are to have as their moral goal “that [their] lives and posterity may be... preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world to serve the Lord” (*Model of Christian Charity* 45). Therefore,

4. A literalistically read Bible requires the Colonists to live better lives than they did in England, and thereby avoid England’s disdain. According to Winthrop, unconditionally obeying their Leadership, the colony is to “love life” in ways which attract the admiration, and never the disdain of England (*Model of Christian Charity* 46)

5. A literalistically read Bible requires that the Colony follow its rules EXACTLY. The Community must govern itself according to literalistic practices given in the Bible. According to Winthrop, to not do so is to disobey. Disobedience risks Divine punishment, and as evidenced by “Cotton’s Old Testament Law Code” potentially harsh consequences are always possible for those who so offend (*Journal* 107).

6. A literalistically read Bible requires the Colony to view the roles of women in certain ways. The subjugation of women in life, marriage, and church governance is a given (*Twelve Treatises of Faith*).

7. A literalistically read Bible requires that the Colony punish wrongdoers harshly. It supports the leadership’s decisions to maintain control of its citizens by inflicting potentially harsh disciplinary measures.

8. A literalistically read Bible with uniformity of belief as its goal supports the stability of the Colony. Free thinking contributes to libertinism and social anarchy.

### **Winthrop and Cotton's Typological Transformations and the Rhetorical Invocations**

*John Winthrop and John Cotton's Representative Uses of Typology.* Like other Puritans, Cotton and Winthrop approach the Bible typologically. For example, in his homily the *Model of Christian Charity*, Winthrop quite often reads Bible texts as prophetic fulfillment. He typologically reads the Bible texts which portrays the nation Israel and its history as a divine example, and a prophetic foreshadowing of another people or events appearing in the future. For Winthrop those other people and events sit right before him. The future is now. Winthrop, therefore, uses typology in his sermon appealing to the colonists' image of themselves as a new kind of new Israel. And since God superintends history, Winthrop expects those aboard the *Arabella* to be active parts of this divinely guided salvation history. He conveniently uses this sense of this typological fulfillment to motivate his missionaries to fulfill his anti-typological expectations.

Typologically altering Israel's story in this way, Winthrop much like Cotton and Hutchinson described later, presents the Boston Colony as the fulfillment (anti-type) of Israel (type). He typologically transforms standard understandings of specific Old Testament Texts, and then uses them to rhetorically invoke or justify certain behaviors he envisions for his followers. His homily both begins and ends with how a literal Israel (the type) is the model for the anti-type, spiritual Israel (the Colony) who will soon

inhabit the Bay Colony. Interestingly, before the beginning of his sermon a typologically styled title appears:

WRITTEN ON BOARD THE ARBELLA, ON THE ATLANTIC OCEAN. By the Hon. John Winthrop Esqr. *In his passage with a great company of Religious people* (italics mine), of which *Christian tribes* (italics mine) he was the and famous Governor; from the Island of Great Brittain to New-England in the North America. Anno 1630. (*A Model of Christian Charity* 33)

Here Winthrop or his later transcriber (?) introduces the homily with a reference to the exalted role of the Puritan people. Beginning with a reference to the “Christian Tribes”, he proceeds in the spirit of typological fulfillment, Winthrop or his transcriber (?) refers to himself as a “Brave Leader” leading the Israelite-like colonists, “a great company of religious people”. They are “Christian tribes” (the Bay Colony), another Israel who like the Israelites of old have been left their past back on the “Island of Great Brittain”. They have been providentially guided to “New England in North America”. Anti-typologically, Winthrop views himself as the leader in the new world of “Christian Tribes” (*Model of Christian Charity* 33).

Typologically, then, this basic understanding applied to the Bible means at least four things.

*The Bible Read Typologically Requires the Colonists to Embrace Their Divine Given Mission and Prosperity.* This typological transformation also continues throughout the entirety of Winthrop’s sermon and lasts right up to the very end. In its highest culminating moment, Winthrop concludes his sermon by refashioning Moses’ ancient speech given to the Israelites upon their entrance into the Promised Land. He transfigures and adapts this story to his colonists’ mission in the New World. Ancient Israel’s story becomes the colonists’ story. It becomes the colonists’ pattern. Typologically renovating

the story of the Jews appearing in Deuteronomy 30, Winthrop rhetorically obligates his Colonists antitypical obedience to his words. Referencing and requiring the colonists to obey the typologies of Ancient Text he has anti-typologically refashioned, he says with a leader's voice:

I shall shut up this discourse with that exhortation of Moses, that faithful servant of the Lord, in his last farewell to Israel, Deut. 30. Beloved there is now set before us life and good, Death and evil, in that we are commanded this day to love the Lord our God, and to love one another, to walk in his ways and to keep his Commandments and his Ordinance and his laws, and the articles of our Covenant with him, that we may live and be multiplied, and that the Lord our God may bless us in the land whither we go to possess it. But if our hearts shall turn away, so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced, and worship and serve other Gods, our pleasure and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither wee pass over this vast sea to possess it; ***Therefore let us choose life that wee, and our seed may live, by obeying His voice and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and our prosperity*** (italics mine). (*A Model of Christian Charity* 48)

He concludes this speech by typologically transforming ancient Israel into the new People of God (the Colony). He uses the Israel of the Bible to serve as a prediction and justification for how God can also be expected to deal with the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Guided by the basic belief that the Colony is an antitype of Israel, Winthrop commands the Colony to follow all that he envisions for them in God's name. This is their mission.

This same kind of typological transformation also appears in a farewell sermon spoken by John Cotton to passengers departing from South Hampton for New England in 1630. These similar Textual alterations and applications appear in the frontispiece of his sermon *God's Promise to His Plantation*. These words excellently summarize the typological spirit, words, and latent agendas characterizing his Cotton's homily, too. For example, beneath his title on the first page appears two quotations. The first is II Samuel

7: 10 which reads: “Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and I will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more.” Psalm 22: 27- 31 appear right below that Text, as well<sup>22</sup>.

*The Bible when read typologically also requires the Colony’s Strict Adherence to the ‘Rule Book’.* For example, right before Winthrop concludes his message to his *Arbella* passengers, Winthrop connects the Colony with Israel again time by quoting, and changing the words of a seventh century B.C., pre-exilic, prophet named Amos: “You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore will I punish you for all your transgressions” (Amos 3:2.). Winthrop with prophetic force warns the Colony that they are entering into an agreement with a God who also punishes group disobedience.

Thus stands the cause between God and us: we are entered into covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a commission. The Lord has given us leave to draw our own articles; we have professed to enterprise these actions upon these and these ends; we have hereupon besought Him of favor and blessing. Now if the Lord shall please to hear us and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then has He ratified this Covenant and sealed our commission, [and] will expect a strict performance of the articles contained in it. ***But if we shall neglect the observation of these articles, which are the ends we have propounded, and dissembling with our God shall fall to embrace this present world and prosecute our carnal intentions, seeking great things for ourselves and our posterity, the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us, be revenged of such a perjured people, and make us know the price of the breach of such a covenant*** (italics mine). (*Model of Christian Charity* 12)

---

<sup>22</sup> Psalm 22:27-31 reads: All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the LORD's: and he is the governor among the nations. All they that be fat upon earth shall eat and worship: all they that go down to the dust shall bow before him: and none can keep alive his own soul. A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come, and shall declare his righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done this.



Winthrop, reading Deuteronomy 3 reads the Text typologically with reference to the Colonists. Reading it in this way, he rhetorically enforces his expectations for them to strictly adhere to this agreement, and to carry it out. He also uses the story to outline the potential price of their disobedience<sup>23</sup>.

*Read Typologically the Bible Also Supports the Colonists' Subjugation of a New Land and its Peoples.* The illuminative texts found in John Cotton's *God's Promise to His Plantation* reveal how he also typologically reconfigures the meaning of Bible passages. Like Winthrop, he makes the Puritan colony an anti-type of Israel. He furthermore declares that this new Israel (the Colony) is divinely planted in a new land given to them by God to possess. He typologically alters Old Testament texts to claim

---

<sup>23</sup> 14 Then the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thy days are come, that thou must die: Call Joshua, and stand ye in the Tabernacle of the Congregation that I may give him a charge. So Moses and Joshua went, and stood in the Tabernacle of the Congregation. 15 And the Lord appeared in the Tabernacle in the pillar of a cloud: and the pillar of the cloud stood over the door of the Tabernacle. 16 And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, and this people will rise up, and go a whoring after the gods of a strange land (whither they go to dwell therein) and will forsake me: and break my covenant which I have made with them. 17 Wherefore my wrath will wax hot against them at that day, and I will forsake them, and will hide my face from them: then they shall be consumed, and many adversities and tribulations shall come upon them: so then they will say, Are not these troubles come upon me, because God is not with me? 18 But I will surely hide my face in that day, because of all the evil which they shall commit, in that they are turned unto other gods 19 Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it the children of Israel: put it in their mouths, that this song may be my witness against the children of Israel. 20 For I will bring them into the land (which I swore unto their fathers) that floweth with milk and honey: and they shall eat and fill themselves, and wax fat: then shall they turn unto other gods, and serve them, and contemn me, and break my covenant. 21 And then when many adversities and tribulations shall come upon them, this song shall answer them to their faces as a witness: for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their posterity: for I know their imagination, which they go about even now, before I have brought them into the land which I swore 22. Moses therefore wrote this song the same day, and taught it the children of Israel. 23 Deuteronomy 31:14-24 (GNV)

that the Divine placement of the colonists is naturally accompanied by a guarantee. By fulfilling their mission in this new land, they will be admired and revered by “the Nations”, a reference which could possibly include the indigenous tribes (?). “All the ends of the world shall remember and turne unto the Lord, and *all the kindreds of the Nations shall worship before thee* (italics mine)” (*Digital Commons* 4). It might not be surprising, then, that the Bible gets typologically read in also one more related way.

Additionally, the selected Bible verses written in the sermon’s frontispiece to Cotton’s sermon is even yet one more example of a typological reading of the Text. If reverence and honor by the nations is the Divine destiny of the New Colony, then they need to make sure they do what is commanded in order to receive the promised benefits. This means colonists must profess and possess what God has destined them to be, to do, and to have. In the words of Cotton:

In every place ... God appoints us to sit down, to acknowledge him as our Landlord. The earth is the Lords, and the fullness thereof; his are our Countries, our Townes, our houses; and therefore let us acknowledge him in them all. (*God’s Design for His Plantation* 4)

In essence, Cotton gives a typological transformative twist here to Psalm 24:1: “The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof.” Originally a ‘psalm of ascent’, part of an ancient song, the Israelites sang this song each year as they made their steep pilgrimages out of the valley and up Jerusalem to celebrate their holy days. Yet Cotton does not treat this as a song. He reads it, instead, as a verse to validate Massachusetts Bay Colony’s right to possess all that lies before them. If God is the Landlord of literal Israel, then according to Cotton’s reconstitutions, God is also the Owner of all that is before them as a spiritual Israel. They are God’s and whatever is His is also theirs. Even though

what they are receiving is actually something they are taking from the indigenous tribes; still, based on Cotton's typological transformations, the colonists are asked to acknowledge this. Divine ownership makes possible and necessary all they desire.

Again in *God's Design for His Plantation*, Cotton also typologically transforms the meaning of the Apostle Paul's homily to the Athenians. Referring to Acts 17. 26, 27, "He hath appointed the times, and places of our habitation, that we might seek and grope after the Lord"; Cotton refashions a mid-fifties A.D. statement of Paul about God's universal self-disclosure to all peoples of the earth. Originally, Paul is addressing polytheists and asking them to consider his personal claims about a monotheistic faith. His words have nothing to do with the subduing of a land and those who originally inhabit it. Yet, Cotton typologically reads this Text as referring the Colonists. He asks his listeners to rise up and conquer the land. This, after all, is their appointed time and appointed place. It's time for them to be about their mission and to "grope after the Lord" (*God's Design for His Plantation* 12).

But perhaps the best example of how typology is used to validate the Colony's right to subjugate its neighbors appears four years later after John Winthrop's inaugural sermon, *The Model of Christian Charity* (1630). In Winthrop's "Letter to Nathaniel Rich" dated May 22 1634, an indirect typological reference to the Israelites conquest of Canaan appears. Informed by typologically transformed meanings associated with Old Testament conquest stories, Winthrop references the Israelites who drives out the enemies from their destined Promised Land (Exodus, Deuteronomy and Numbers). He applies his meanings of these stories from their Sources, and he justifies to Rich how the Colony is rightfully assuming Native lands for its own expansion.

To Rich Winthrop writes, “For the natives, they are near all dead of the smallpox, so *the Lord hath cleared our title to what we possess* (italics mine)” (Gilder Lehrman Collection). Winthrop’s presumed sense of entitlement transforms literal Israel’s story typologically. As a result of this revision, he endorses and promotes his views that the Colony (spiritual Israel) has both divine sanction and obligation to possess the lands of Native Americans (spiritual Israel’s foes). For Winthrop, Israel’s right to conquest Canaan justifies the subjugation of spiritual Israel’s enemies, the Native Peoples. As a result, it is expected that the colony will subject those indigenous peoples around them to their rule and expansive purposes.

*Summary.* Winthrop and Cotton’s typological approach to Scripture is, therefore, the result of their Puritan thinking processes. When both typologically transform the meaning of words in an Old Testament Text, they first focus on the direct or indirect allusions of a Text to God and Israel. Then, altering the selected reference to an historical, literal Israel, they cause their references to refer to a ‘spiritual’ Israel, the Massachusetts Bay Colony. This then results in the Colony becoming identified with ancient Israel with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereof. Finally, based on these kinds of revisions, both Winthrop and Cotton rhetorically empower and demand that colonists fulfill their divine destiny. Using transformed and invested language, they then communicate the Followers’ responsibility to subjugate the land, its inhabitants, and its wealth.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Winthrop typologically transforms and rhetorically applies other texts in *The Model of Christian Charity*. These include texts referencing the disobedience of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10:1-2); the destruction of God’s enemy Amalek (I Samuel 15; 28:16-18); the breaching of the Covenant (Micah 6:8). He also makes use of similes (Matthew 5:13-16).

As a result, the Bible read typologically causes at least three themes to emerge: 1) The colonists must embrace their divine given mission and prosperity. 2) They must strictly adhere to the 'Rule Book'; and finally, 3) the colonists must willingly and actively subjugate their new land and its indigenous peoples.

### **Some Selected Representative Uses of Winthrop and Cotton's Use of Allegory**

There are also occasions in their sermons when both Cotton and Winthrop read allegorically. That is, they read figuratively and invent novel interpretations for a given Bible Text in order to appeal for certain actions from their audience. They read in the ways Bernard Ramm defines as allegorical. They understand and communicate the relationships between certain persons and things "by substituting a whole range of persons or things from an entirely different sphere of experience' (*Protestant Biblical Interpretation* 23).

For a concrete example of how this works in Puritan times, one might consider an example provided by Leland Ryken. Citing an allegorical reading of the Song of Solomon 1:13, "My beloved is to me a bag of myrrh which lies between my two breasts"; Ryken illustrates how allegorically, the phrase "the bag of Myrrh" gets humorously construed as a reference to the "Christ who stands between the two Testaments." Or, he describes how other allegorists of the same Puritan period claim the phrase "the two breasts" to be "the learned teachers in the church" (*Worldly Saints* 145). Allegorical readings, like those seen here, are interpretations where readers interpose some peculiar or novel idea upon a Bible text. Then they go one step farther and claim it as the Text's 'real' or 'deeper meaning'. Rhetorically, such a move increases its audience appeal.

With regard to this maneuver, consider, for example, a sermon specifically devoted to describing the mission of the colonists, one which is expressed in allegorical terms. In *God's Promises to His Plantation*, Cotton fills his homily with allegories and metaphors, especially in one section where he asks: "What is it for God to plant a people?" Clearly admitting his use of metaphorical language to describe the relationship of the Colony and connecting such expression to the metaphorical language of the Bible; Cotton uses many Old Testament allegories to speak of the nation Israel which pictures the colony. His choice of images in his homily *God's Promises to His Plantation* include allegories such as the "plants" (Psalm 80. 8, 9, 10, 11), the fruitful "tree" (Psalm 1. 4), "the tree of righteousness" (Isaiah 61. 3), "a nail and a place in his Tabernacle" (Isaiah 56. 5), "calves in the stall" (Mal. 4. 2, 3), and fruit (John 15. 1. 2). Allegorically reassigning these metaphors which once referred to Israel, Cotton revises them to describe the current mission of the colonists who are also God's chosen people. Using these allegorical transformations, he rhetorically binds his followers to remember that they must "continue and abide in the state of grace", for God's purposes are to "plant us in his holy Sanctuary", and He has no plans to be "rooting us up" (*God's Promise to His Plantation* 12-15).

Winthrop also reads allegories in these same ways. In *The Model of Christian Charity*, for example, he explains the meaning and the ramifications of a Text conservatively dated and originating from the AD 90's: "love cometh from God and everyone that loveth is born of God (I John 4:7)". Winthrop allegorizes these words from John the Elder's occasional New Testament Epistle and says that "this love is the fruit

of the new birth and none can have it but the new creature.” (*The Model of Christian Charity* 5)

Furthering his argument about love, Winthrop then uses more disparate Biblical images in his *Model of Christian Charity*. To illustrate his point, he lifts these unrelated images, ideas, or events from their original contexts. Investing these with figurative power, he adapts them. Based on the images, he makes authoritative claims for his listeners’ lives investing his directives with rhetorical power. His allegorical transformations about Christian love ends up looking like this:

Now when this quality is thus formed in the souls of men, it works like the Spirit upon the dry bones. (Ezek.37. Bone came to bone. It gathers together the scattered bones. Or perfect old man Adam, and knits them in to one body again in Christ whereby a man is become a living soul. (*Model of Christian Charity* 5)

To illustrate his point about the obligation of Christian love, he creates supportive allegories by synchronizing dissimilar images (dry bones in the desert, bones coming together, old man Adam, knitting of bones into a body; and a “man becoming a living soul”) from unrelated verses (Ezekiel 37; Colossians 3:9-10; Ephesians 4:22; Romans 6:6; I Corinthians 15:45; Genesis 2:7). Reading these passages, Winthrop invests his unique and novel ideas into them. The Spirit giving new life to the dry bones of Adam becomes a picture of the Christian Church. Stringing together these invested and fanciful illustrations he builds the case for his hearers to love each other (*Model of Christian Charity* 5).

Winthrop also uses another allegory in the same creative way to again require his listeners to have love for each other. Says he,

So a mother loves her child, because she thoroughly conceives a resemblance of herself in it. Thus it is between the members of Christ: each discerns by the work

of the Spirit his own image and resemblance in another, and therefore cannot but love him as he loves himself. *Now when the soul, which is of a sociable nature, finds anything like to itself, it is like Adam when Eve was brought to him. She must have it one with herself. "This is flesh of my flesh," (says she) and "bone of my bone."* (italics mine). She conceives a great delight in it; therefore she desires nearness and familiarity with it. She has a great propensity to do it good, and receives such content in it, as fearing the miscarriage of her beloved, she bestows it in the inmost closet of her heart. She will not endure that it shall want any good which she can give it. If by occasion she be withdrawn from the company of it, she is still looking towards the place where she left her beloved. If she hear it groan, she is with it presently. If she find it sad and disconsolate, she sighs and mourns with it. She has no such joy, as to see her beloved merry and thriving. If she see it wronged, she cannot bear it without passion. She sets no bounds of her affections, nor has any thought of reward. She finds recompense enough in the exercise of her love towards it. (*Model of Christian Charity* 5)

Once again, insisting that his followers love each other, Winthrop strings together allegorical images (the introduction of Adam to Eve, *her* “one flesh” experience, and *her* “bone of my bone” and “flesh of my flesh” exclamations from Genesis 2, especially verse 23. He reads this passage and once again invests his unique and novel ideas about love into these Texts. With an interpretive twist, Eve’s one flesh experience with Adam becomes a picture of fervent love in which the entire community can participate (*Model of Christian Charity* 5)<sup>25</sup>!

*Summary:* There are many occasions in their sermons when both Cotton and Winthrop read allegorically. They figuratively invent novel interpretations for a given Bible text so that they can appeal for some action from their audience. They read in the ways Bernard Ramm defines as allegorical to communicate their understandings of the relationships between certain persons and things “by substituting a whole range of persons or things from an entirely different sphere of experience” (Ramm 223). They use

---

<sup>25</sup> Winthrop uses even more allegorical examples drawn from the Bible’s examples of Johnathan and David, as well as Ruth and Naomi (*Model of Christian Charity* 7).



their fanciful interpretations as a call for specific actions by 1.) describing or enjoining the mission upon their followers; and 2.) authoritatively claiming certain actions as appropriate for all of them.

### **Chapter Summary**

There seems to be a pattern in these selected writings of Cotton and Winthrop in the ways the normal meaning of Bible Texts are literalistically, typologically, or allegorically transformed and rhetorically invoked to prompt certain actions of those living in the Colony. These forms provide a literary context for understanding the ways Cotton and Winthrop use the Bible in their authoritarian agendas. And as will be seen in the next two chapters, Hutchinson uses these same approaches in her dialogs with Cotton and Winthrop during her civic and religious trials, too. However, she use these same approaches to obtain different outcomes.

*To summarize, then, there are specific literalistic reading practices from which Winthrop and Cotton's authoritarian themes emerge.* These practices also sponsor the same types of themes present in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic and ecclesiastical trials of 1637-1638. As regards John Winthrop and John Cotton's literalistic readings of the Bible, the author has demonstrated in this chapter that:

1.) When read literalistically, the Bible is a 'Rule Book' which must be observed. Love in the Colony operates as a 'true rule for the public'. According to Winthrop, all citizens are to allow nothing which leads to the "ruin of the public" (*Model of Christian Charity* 9).

2.) A literalistically read Bible requires that all Colonists love each other in their civic lives. The Colony is expected to demonstrate its love in the new world. Love is

primarily an obedience to the rules and its rulers. According to Winthrop, love is always motivated by that which insures the Colony's self-preservation (*Model of Christian Charity* 45).

3.) A literalistically read Bible requires a set of moral goals for the Colony. According to Winthrop, it is expected that Colonists will be known for "loving life". This means that a new goal exists among newcomers. They are to give themselves to the "working out of [their] salvation", improving their lives so that they can "do more service to the Lord. They are to have as their moral goal "that [their] lives and posterity may be... preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world to serve the Lord" (*Model of Christian Charity* 45). Therefore,

4.) A literalistically read Bible requires the Colonists to live better lives than they did in England and thereby avoid England's disdain. According to Winthrop, unconditionally obeying their Leadership, the colony is to "love life" in ways which attract the admiration, and never the disdain of England (*Model of Christian Charity* 46)

5.) A literalistically read Bible requires that the Colony follow its rules EXACTLY. The Community must govern itself according to literalistic practices given in the Bible. According to Winthrop, to not do so is to disobey. Disobedience risks Divine punishment, and as evidenced by "Cotton's Old Testament Law Code" harsh consequences exist for those who so offend (*Journal* 107).

6.) A literalistically read Bible requires the Colony to view the roles of women in certain ways. The subjugation of women in life, marriage, and church governance is a given (*Twelve Treatises of Faith*).

7.) A literalistically read Bible requires that the Colony punish wrongdoers

harshly. It supports the leadership's decisions to maintain control of its citizens by inflicting potentially harsh disciplinary measures.

8.) A literalistically read Bible with uniformity of belief as its goal support the stability of the Colony. Free thinking contributes to libertinism and social anarchy.

*And as regards the typological readings of Biblical Text, generally speaking, there seems to a connection in Winthrop and Cotton's readings between a literal Israel and a 'spiritual' Israel, the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The Colony is part of a great salvation history. Altogether, they are a fulfillment of a plan begun thousands of years ago. As also shown, the Massachusetts Bay Colony is closely identified with historical Israel as regards all the rights, privileges and responsibilities thereof. In light of these allegorical readings and communicated understandings, the Colonists must triumphally fulfill their divine destiny. They have the Divine right and responsibility to subjugate the land, its inhabitants, and its wealth.*<sup>26</sup>

Attending these typological uses of Scripture are specific themes which emerge from Cotton and Winthrop's typological and rhetorical practices. These themes are at work in the transcripts of Hutchinson's civic and ecclesiastical trials dated 1637-1638. As regards John Winthrop and John Cotton's literalistic readings of the Bible, the author has demonstrated that: their practice of reading the Bible typologically causes at least three themes to emerge. Similar to those literalistic uses already mentioned, these typologies are used to show how 1.) the colonists must embrace their divine given mission and

---

<sup>26</sup> Winthrop typologically transforms and rhetorically applies other texts in *The Model of Christian Charity*. These include texts referencing the disobedience of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10:1-2); the destruction of God's enemy Amalek (I Samuel 15; 28:16-18); the breaching of the Covenant (Micah 6:8). He also makes use of similes (Matthew 5:13-16).

prosperity; how 2.) they must strictly adhere to the ‘Rule Book’; and finally, 3.) how the colonists must subjugate their new land and its indigenous peoples.

*Finally, with regards to allegories Winthrop and Cotton often use real allegories occurring in the Bible Text, or they invest their fanciful allegorical interpretations into a normally understood literal Text.* By whatever means, these become charged images drawn from an authoritative Source to illustrate or demand the actions they want their followers do. Reading figuratively, the author has demonstrated how they figuratively invent novel interpretations for a given Bible text so that they can appeal for some action from their audience. She has shown how their allegorical practices create fanciful interpretations which serve as 1.) as a call for specific actions which describe or enjoin the mission upon their followers; and 2.) authoritatively claiming certain actions as appropriate for them.

All together these themes deriving from observed hermeneutical practices provide a necessary literary context for understanding Hutchinson’s civic and ecclesiastical trials. These help explain the trials often opaque language, the thinking associated with Scripture’s transformative and rhetorical use, as well as if theological dialogs of Hutchinson’s transcripts. These principles also explain *how* meanings are made. By understanding *how* meanings are made, it becomes even more possible to think about all the meanings a Text could possibly have.

### CHAPTER III

#### WINTHROP, COTTON, AND HUTCHINSON'S LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF MEANINGS IN THE COLONY'S PROTESTANT BIBLE AND THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S CIVIC TRIAL (NOVEMBER 1637)

##### Introduction

*My Analytical Approach.* As just seen in Chapter II the literalistic, allegorical, and typological uses of Scripture's meanings, as well as their accompanying rhetorical uses, are quite common in the writings of Winthrop and Cotton. I will now show how Cotton and Winthrop use the Bible to demand certain actions of Hutchinson and her followers, and how Hutchinson in dialog with them reads and uses the Bible in similar ways to resist them. Altogether, their uses of the Bible are characterized and motivated by a mutual desire to win a struggle.

In order to illustrate how these dialogical processes happen, the author will offer in this chapter the where, how, and why these rhetorical patterns appear in two primary sources for Hutchinson's November 1637 trial. The first source, the most complete version of this trial (occupying fifty-six quarto pages of manuscript), is "*A Report of the Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson*". Copied in 1771 by Yale's first President Ezra Stiles while a pastor at Newport, this manuscript is now located at the Library of Yale College. It replicates an original manuscript which is "not now traceable" (*A Report of the Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson before the Church*).

The second source used in this analysis is that of John Winthrop's diary entitled, *The Short Story of the Rise and Reign and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists and Libertines that Infected the Churches of New England*<sup>27</sup>. Edited by Thomas Welde in 1692<sup>28</sup>, this transcript supplies some supportive nuances or material for the gaps found in the dialogs of the fuller transcript edited by Stiles. The author will therefore work 'synoptically' with both sources in order to create a composite picture of Hutchinson's hermeneutical and rhetorical struggles with Winthrop and Cotton.

This use of these co-mingled sources will also illustrate how Hutchinson's hermeneutical and rhetorical ways are exactly like those of her detractors. This chapter will show how Hutchinson also responds in kind to Winthrop and Cotton as a literalistic, typological, or allegorical reader of Biblical texts. It will demonstrate how she also uses their interpretive patterns to rhetorically serve the purposes of her own defense before them. Through an in depth analysis, this chapter will show how her uses of Scripture,

---

<sup>27</sup> Winthrop's long and summative title captures the insights which his account contains. His text, edited by Thomas Welde, is originally entitled: *A SHORT STORY Of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists, and Libertines That Infected the CHURCHES Of New-England: And how they were Confuted by The Assembly of Ministers there: As also of the Magistrates proceedings in Court against them. Together with God's strange Remarkable Judgments from Heaven upon some of the Chief Fomenters of these Opinions; And the Lamentable Death of Mrs. Hutchison. Very fit for these Times; here being the same Errors amongst us, and Acted by the same Spirit. Published at the Instant Request of Sundry, by one that was an Eye and Ear-witness of the carriage of Matters there.*

<sup>28</sup> For a complete history of the three editions of Winthrop's history, see David Hall's *Antinomian Controversy: A Documentary History*. Hall's inclusion of John Winthrop's *Short Story of the Rise and Reign and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists and Libertines that Infected the Churches of New England*, Chapter Eight, covers the history of the appearance of the three editions (199-202).

though the same as her accusers, have different purposes; how the same Bible read by the same people have different agendas associated with their readings.

Generally speaking, these agendas revolve around power and the mutual struggles associated with its exercise or resistance. In these transcripts Governor John Winthrop's and Pastor John Cotton's despotic interpretation of truth/law is handed down to the Colony by them. They expect all colonists to agree and act in accordance with their authoritarian interpretation of God's voice as presented in their readings of the Bible. Antinomian leader Hutchinson and her followers differ with the interpretive results of these prevailing views, however; for these transcripts Hutchinson believes that truth/law is to be democratically grasped by all members of the Colony. For her truth claims by rulers are to be subject to the perennial challenge of its followers. Assertions for truth are not to be automatically accepted. This enduring defiance requires of all colonists the privilege and responsibility of free-thinking. From free-thinking comes living freely. Living freely in this sense for the Colony rulers is bad for it has potential to sponsor an antinomian lifestyle. Just how can leaders control people who are encouraged to think and act responsibly for themselves? This is the prevailing issue, it seems.

Therefore, the author will show how Hutchinson is called to give an account for this posture and practice. She will illustrate how, according to Winthrop's *Short Story*, Hutchinson puts herself at odds with the Colony. Her falling out of favor is attributed by them to the fact that she holds house meetings for the purposes of Bible studies at least twice per week. Usually thirty or forty persons attend these meetings, and Governor Winthrop fears that these meetings are not just for the normal purposes of repeating and studying the Preacher's Sunday sermons. No. He believes that Hutchinson as a female is

offering her opinions about these sermons, and that she is actually challenging the preachers' pronouncements. He and others fear, therefore, that during these meetings Hutchinson is encouraging a growing group critique and disagreement with authorized spokespersons of truth. He believes that "indeed most of [Hutchinson's] New Tenets tend[s] to slothfulness, and [to] quench all endeavor in the Creature", and that her expressed views ultimately tend towards the [villif [ication]of Sanctification" (Weld 34). For Winthrop, Hutchinson's "advancing Christ and Free-grace" encourages disorder. She and her followers are an "infection" in the Colony (*Short Story* 35) for they encourage the Colony to disregard the Leaders rules of governance which are claimed as Biblical.

In this chapter as well as the next, then, the author will demonstrate what some selected literalistic, allegorical, and typological readings look like when Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson use the same approaches to exert their subjugating or liberating power claims. She will especially highlight how their uses just described in Chapter Two serve as a means to an end, how their agendas are reflected in their Bible readings, and how their resulting dialogs shape the issues, the invocative rhetoric, and the actions of all.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Briefly, for purposes of convenient reference, the writer has shown in Chapter II that these hermeneutical/rhetorical practices associated with a literalistic reading of the Bible comprise the following. With agendas foremost in their minds, Hutchinson, Winthrop, and Cotton use the Bible in certain ways. The Bible gets used as a 'Rule Book' when certain agendas and actions are desired. The Bible is read literalistically to require all Colonists love each other in their civic lives; or to require that they keep a set of moral goals. A literalistically read Bible is used to persuade Colonists to live better lives than they did in England, and thereby avoid England's disdain. Or, in order to obligate their followers, to obey, leaders use the Bible to require that all living in the Colony follow their rules EXACTLY. According to Winthrop, to not do so is to disobey. To justify the authoritative subjection of women to male domination, or for the leadership to maintain control of its citizens by inflicting harsh disciplinary measures, the Bible is read



*The Life and Times of Anne Hutchinson: A Brief Overview.* So, just before this analysis begins, it might be helpful to succinctly offer an overview of the events attending Hutchinson's civic and ecclesiastical trials. According to Stile's text of the trial, Hutchinson's response to her challengers divide into two parts: the two day civil trial (November 1637), and the two day ecclesiastical trial (March 1638). In the civil trial (Chapter III), her guilt is established and her repentance is required by the court. In the ecclesiastical trial (Chapter IV), however, her guilt is affirmed, her repentance personally resisted, and her consequent ousting by the Church achieved.

Because Hutchinson believes that the leadership's interpretation of Scripture should be democratically discussed and not just despotically obeyed, she and the other controversialists she influences are branded by the court as heretics (November 1637). Since in the eyes of the court, heresy is the same thing as sedition, she is banished from the Colony by the Court in March 1638. (The court had silenced and banished other Antinomians previously in November 1637.)

After her banishment in March 1638 Hutchinson, now a widow, is forced to leave for Rhode Island with her family of six children. After a brief time of life and continued

---

literalistically. Or, to support the Leader's desires for uniformity of belief and the survival of the Colony, it is read in the same way.

The leadership often connects literal Israel and a 'spiritual' Israel (the Massachusetts Bay Colony) in order to require the colonists to embrace their divinely given mission and prosperity. This happens through their typological readings of Scripture.

In a very much related way, leaders often require specific actions and describe or enjoin the mission upon their followers, so the Bible is read allegorically to support these endeavors.

ministry there, she later relocates to today's Manhattan, New York. There she, her family, and household attendants meet their deaths during Kieft's War in March 1643. Confusing her for a Dutch immigrant, those of the indigenous Sycamore tribe scalp her, and they also burn her house to the ground. Her one surviving child, a daughter Susannah, is taken hostage by the tribe. Upon hearing this back home, the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony rejoice. They give praise to God for this act of divine vengeance.

### **The Use of the Bible during the Civic Trial (November 1637)**

*The Leaders Desire to Protect and Preserve the Reputations of its Colony's Rulers and Read the Bible Literalistically to do it.* Using a literary device known as 'flashback', Winthrop in his Short Story relates a post-banishment visit with Hutchinson by the Elders (sometime after January 1638?). Unlike Stile's version of the transcript where the trial commences on a Lecture Day in November 1637, Winthrop begins his reflections with a post-trial flashback. One can see in this section how he reads the Bible literalistically to protect the reputations of its Colony's leadership.

His diary reads:

Now I am upon Mistress Hutchison's Story, I will digress a little to give you a farther taste of her spirit, viz. After she was gone from us to the Island, the Church of Boston sent unto her four of their Members, (men of a lovely and winning spirit, as most likely to prevail) ***to see if they could convince and reduce her, according to 2 Thess. 3. 13*** (italics mine) When they came first unto her, she asked from whom they came, and what was their business? They answered, We are come in the name of the Lord Jesus, from the Church of Christ at Boston, to labor to convince you of, &c—At that word she (being filled with as much disdain in her countenance, as bitterness in her spirit) replied, What, from the Church at Boston? ***I know no such Church, neither will I own it, call it the Whore and Strumpet of Boston,*** no Church of Christ: so they said no more, seeing her so desperate, but returned. Behold the spirit of error, to what a pass it drives a Man! (*Short Story*, Page Unnumbered)

Winthrop begins his re-telling of the Hutchinson story by recording how after Hutchinson's final ecclesiastical trial and banishment, the Church of Boston sent three or four of its members to visit with her in Rhode Island. These "men of a lovely and winning spirit, as most likely to prevail" from the Boston Church had just recently banished Hutchinson with finality in their voices (*Short Story* unnumbered pages)! Yet, Winthrop relates how after Hutchinson's forced departure, the Colony engaged in redemptive efforts to win and bring her back; and how they justified these efforts with a literalistic use of II Thessalonians 3:13: "But ye, brethren, be not weary in well doing".

Desiring to insure the reputations of its Colony's leadership, Winthrop recounts the story of this visit, and reads the biblical Text of II Thessalonians 3:13 literalistically with a view of supporting their agenda.

And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. (II Thessalonians 3: 14, 15).

He reports how Hutchinson's visitors chose to read Paul's words about a temporary *rehabilitative* shunning, and connecting the same with their desire to see "***if they could convince and reduce her*** (italics mine)" (*Short Story* Unnumbered pages). It seems curious, though, why these visitors would want to attempt to restore a banished heretic back to the Colony from whence she came. Indeed, as seen in Chapter IV the language associated with that banishment reads so emphatically final. Regardless, though, Winthrop recounts how the visitors from Boston attempted to do so. And what reads like a rhetorical move to justify the actions of the Colony and these visitors, Winthrop cites II Thessalonians 3:13, "But ye, brethren, be not weary in well doing."

So rhetorically speaking, what is happening here? The author believes there is an agenda accompanying this literalistic reading of II Thessalonians 3:13, and it is this. Winthrop and the Colony wish to incite the reader's adulation for those who judged and banished Hutchinson. Winthrop reads as it were with the implied attitude and words, 'Just look at how the Elder's tried!' In this view, Winthrop for the record wants Hutchinson's judges to be regarded and, indeed applauded, as "men of a lovely and winning spirit, as most likely to prevail". Through his celebratory words, Winthrop exonerates the reputations of the "brethren" and her judges. He extols them for time and eternity as adjudicators who are not "weary in well doing" (*Short Story* 162).

This may also be implied by the way he records the departure of Boston Church representatives: "They said no more, seeing her so desperate, but returned. Behold the spirit of error, to what a pass it drives a Man!" In the end, it is not only the exalted judges' noble acts which "reduce" Hutchinson. Winthrop also "reduces" Hutchinson in the eyes of his all his readers and thereby also exalting himself (*Short Story* 162). But this is only one side of the fight. There is also resistor Hutchinson's.

*Hutchinson, to Exonerate Her Own Culpability Reads the Bible Allegorically.* In retrospect of the former struggle which ousted her, Winthrop reports how Hutchinson also has things to say to these "brethren". Employing a Bible allegory to illustrate her belief and disgust, Hutchinson responds to the Boston Church's appointed entourage who attempt to "convince" her. Hutchinson, according to Winthrop, "filled with as much disdain in her countenance as bitterness in her spirit", says to these visitors, "What, from the Church at Boston? I know no such Church, neither will I own it, ***call it the Whore and Strumpet of Boston, no Church of Christ:*** [italics mine]" (*Short Story*, 162).

Using this metaphor of the “whore” found in the ancient apocalyptic text of the Book of the Revelation (chapters 17:1, 15, 16; 19:2) she re-allegorizes it for her offensive purposes. She reads her own meanings into two connected Bible allegories: the “Great Whore” (Revelation 17:1): and “THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH” (Revelation 19:6). She links the prophetic “Great Whore” with the Church of Boston. She analogizes that just like that symbolic personage found in the ancient Bible context, the Church of Boston is “a woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus:...” (Revelation 17:6)<sup>30</sup>. She claims that by ousting her, the Boston Colony is actually imbibing on the fate of the one who rightfully belongs to God. Implicitly, she defends other Antinomians like herself as well.

Given the fact that Hutchinson later defends her teaching ministry as having been given to her by the Lord, and also one which the Lord warned her would not be welcomed in New England (see Chapter Four); Hutchinson uses this Divine Scripture to justify her present persecutions by the Colony’s leadership. She implies how God, and not the Colony’s leadership, is in control of His female prophet’s life.

Resorting again to another Bible allegory to justify her prophetic role, and to challenge the ways the Colony has treated His female prophet, Hutchinson reads another Apocalypse passage describing how the Boston “Harlot” will be judged by God and His

---

<sup>30</sup> On November 2, 1637 many agreeing with Hutchinson’s views are excommunicated or banished from the Colony. Some are allowed to remain within the Colony and are given a lesser sentence for their participation in the Antinomian Controversy.

true servants the Antinomians avenged (Revelation 19: 2). Quite eerily though, her presently re-allegorized and eventual, literal “blood” will be required of those who are now wrongly persecuting her <sup>31</sup> (*Short Story*, 162).

After this flashback, Winthrop proceeds to recount the trial for his readers. As the trial begins, the Colony’s leadership continues defending their own power and prestige by reading the Bible literalistically, allegorically, and typologically. Hutchinson also reads in these ways in order to justify her resistance and her lack of culpability. In order to keep control of the people’s lives the Boston leadership reads the Text literalistically as an authoritarian ‘Rule Book; and it is this latter reading which appears first in the transcripts.

*In Order to Govern the Colonists’ Lives, the Leaders Read the Bible*

*Literalistically as an Authoritarian ‘Rule Book’*. The first day of Hutchinson’s civic trial begins on Lecture Day in November 1637 <sup>32</sup>. According to Stiles, on said date, an unnamed individual begins the civic trial by offering an opening prayer to God assuring and invoking all listeners that the proceedings will be conducted according to literalistic applications of the Bible.

We have herd this day very sweetly that we are to cast downe all our Crownes at the feete of Ch: Je : ***Soe let every one be content to deny all Relations of Father,***

---

<sup>31</sup> Although Winthrop wrote his version of the trial in retrospect, still if taken at face value, it is almost too coincidental how Hutchinson seems to evidence a premonition of her August 1643 death, along with six of her children, and other household members. Slain by Sycamore Native American in present day Long Island New York, as a result of the Kieft’s War, the only survivor a nine-year-old daughter, Susanna, was taken captive by the tribe. It is indeed interesting that Winthrop in his flash-back records this part of the conversation. What is in it for him to highlight this part of Hutchinson’s conversation with the visitors?

<sup>32</sup> The civic trial will last two days (November 1637) with an additional hearing juxtaposed between both. Hutchinson’s civic trial will then be followed by an ecclesiastical trial during the Spring of March 1638.

*Mother, Sister, Brother, Friend, Enemy* (italics mine) & to cast down all our Crowns & whatsoever Judgment or Opinion that is taken up may be cast down at the Feet of Christ, **& let all be carried by the Rules of God's Word & tried by that Rule** (italics mine), and if there be any Error let no one Rejoice. None but the Devils in Hell will rejoice, but in all our proceedings this day, let us lift up the name of Ch: Jes: **& so proceed in Love in this day's proceeding** (italics mine). (*Trial of Hutchinson*, 162)

Hutchinson's trial commences with the Bible being read literalistically as a 'Rule Book', a Text read by the court to approve, support, or denounce the behaviors of all colonists present. "Let all be carried by the Rules of God's Word & tried by that Rule" (*Trial of Hutchinson*, 162). So says the court. Read literalistically, just like Van Hoozer's definition formerly mentioned in Chapter One, the Bible is not regarded here as a piece of literature. Its' fully colored genres disappear behind the invention and observance of black and white rules. Instead, the Puritan leaders use the Colony's Authoritarian Source to authenticate their agendas.

According to the opening remarks, the observance of this divinely inspired Rule Book is also to be accompanied by "love" (Stiles 62). Appealing to the Bible's authority, the court demands a non-critical allegiance of each person to the Colony. The Court says that in obedience to the Bible, and in the name of the love, all must be willing to "deny all Relations of Father, Mother, Sister, Brother, Friend and Enemy..." (Winthrop 42)<sup>33</sup>.

Later on, the court will appeal to this literalistic use to dictate the allegiance of Hutchinson's children to the Colony. In the name of the Bible, the court will require them

---

<sup>33</sup> The Court is probably making a reference to Matthew 10:37-39: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

to give up their rights to protect their sickly and accused mother. They will be required in the name of the Court's interpretation of the Bible to deny their natural affections for family and support the unity of the Colony. But for now, in addition to the court reading the Bible literalistically in order to maintain control of the Colonists lives, the court's ways of reading also accomplish something else.

*The Leaders Desire to Justify Their Means of Entrapping the Accused and Read the Bible Literalistically in Order to Do So.* As Anne Hutchinson arrives for her civic trial in a physically weakened condition on Day One of the trial (November 1637), she learns how the evidence against her has been collected. Previous to this first day of her civic trial, Mr. Thomas Shephard, Mr. Wells, and "other witnesses" have been gathering information about her. Not long after her arrival to this civic trial, she learns that her accusers had secretly sought to gather testimony unknowingly from her own mouth just four months before (September 1637?). She learns how they have in fact worked to entrap her. Brought before the court to answer for sixteen charges laid against her (Stiles 162)<sup>34</sup>, she and the listening audience hears each allegation read<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup>. Winthrop in his *Short Story* reports how these charges later increased to twenty-nine by the time of her ecclesiastical trial in January 1638 (*Short Story* 62-3).

<sup>35</sup> Winthrop in his *Short Story* summarizes Hutchinson's first appearance at her trial and the motivation of those who tried her in this the following ways: "Mrs. Hutchinson, You are called hither as one of those who have had a great share in the causes of our public disturbances, partly by those Erroneous Opinions which you have broached and divulged amongst us, and maintaining them, partly by countenancing and encouraging such as have sowed Seditions amongst us, partly by casting reproach upon the faithful Ministers of this Country, and upon their Ministry, and so weaken their hands in the work of the Lord, and raising prejudice against them, in the hearts of their People, and partly by maintaining Weekly and Public Meetings in your House, to the offence of all the Country, and the detriment of many Families, and still upholding the same, since such Meetings were clearly Condemned in the late General Assembly. Now the end of your sending for, is, that either upon sight of your Errors, and other Offences, you may be



In response to the charges against her directly created by the elders' literalistic use of the Bible, she requests her judges fully answer her questions about their three previous visits. She responds to their reasons supported by their literalistic uses of the Bible with some of her own literalistic uses.

She demands answers to these questions: What "Rule of the Word" did the elders use when they privately came seeking information on her points of doctrine? She wants to know what "rule" applies to these Elders who previously claimed that they did not "come in the sight of God" to "entrap" or "ensnare" her? She insists on knowing why they refused at the time of their visit to indicate any "unsatisfaction" with what she told them? With a reference to a literalistic rule of Matthew 18:17, she asks just why did they bring her responses "publicly into the Church before they had privately dealt" with her (Stiles 162)<sup>36</sup>?

Citing her own literalistic read of the Bible, she offers a rule derived from her own reading. She accuses them of ignoring a rule of the Bible which says: "Moreover, if

---

brought to acknowledge and reform the same, or otherwise that we may take such course with you, as you may trouble us no farther." (Welde 36)

<sup>36</sup> Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

thy brother shall trespass against thee, *go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone* [Italics mine]" (Matthew 15:15).

Hutchinson tells the leaders that they themselves are the wrong doers. She insists that it is *they* who have erred by having deceptively "inquire[d] for Light" from her. They are the guilty ones because now they use the same answers to bear witness against her. It is they not her who are guilty of a "Breach of Church Rule" (Stiles 162)<sup>37</sup>.

John Cotton balks. He insists that there has been no "manifest Breach of Rule" (Stiles 162). And referring to a Bible text, he literalistically cites a well-known Pauline passage about church governance as related to entertaining accusations about Church elders. Cotton references an occasional Epistle of Paul where he says:

Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, the laborer *is* worthy of his reward. ***Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses (italics mine)***. They that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. (I Timothy 5:19)

Contrary to these words of Paul which in its context speaks only about ministers who serve the church, Cotton justifies the elders' visits by literalistically reading I Timothy 5: 19. He uses this text to support his rule for leveling accusations not against the elders but against the laity. He uses this text to imply divine sanction for the need and methods associated with Hutchinson's investigation. He literalistically reads and

---

<sup>37</sup> References to this "Rule", or "Rule of God's Word", or "Breach of Rule" occurs at least six times in this short passage edited by Stiles (162-164). This once again confirms how the New England Colony uses the Bible in a non-literary way, especially as it relates to its social order. Here in the context of this trial transcript, the Protestant Bible void of its literary merits is quoted as a judicial not devotional source.

transforms the clerical “elder” of I Timothy 5:19, and makes it apply to Hutchinson a layperson.

His reading, though, is contradictory even for a literalist. Hutchinson, in the estimation of the court, is not an “elder”. She is a woman. She cannot be an elder. Ironically, even by the colony’s own definition, this literalistically read Text cannot technically and rightfully apply to Hutchinson. She is only a female layperson. Furthermore, in the eyes of the leaders, she is nothing more than a heretical/seditious, insubordinate, woman who without authorization is attempting to fill a pastor/teacher’s role in a community that fervently disallows it. Strangely, the court is literalistically reading the Bible to justify trying Hutchinson for something that Cotton and the rest say she can never be!

Regardless, the Court now reading I Timothy 5:17 literalistically, claims it as their justification to try Hutchinson by the “Rule of God’s Word” (Stiles 162). And in so doing, they change Paul’s words about church discipline. Shephard with his reference to three “three visits” alters the very words of Paul. Replacing Paul’s “two or three *witnesses* [italics mine]” with their words “two or three “visits”, Shephards’ literalistic revisions actually justifies the way the court gathered its evidence. He divinely sanctions changing Paul’s procedures for Church discipline.

Reading the Divine Source in this way, Winthrop and the court justify for the Colony, their previous investigations of Hutchinson. And as will be seen now, Hutchinson will be tried for her personal opinions which do not officially match those of the leadership. The Court will literalistically read the Bible in order to offer their reasons supporting their requirements for convergent not divergent thinking within the Colony.

*Hutchinson reads The Bible Literalistically to Support Her Ideas of Free-*

*Thinking.* On the first day of her trial, Hutchinson responds and denies ever holding to the many things of which she stands accused. (See Footnote 9.) Particularly, as regards the integral relationship of the human soul and body, its resurrection, and so forth, Hutchinson claims she “only desired to ask a Question” about these things. She says she was in no way attempting to teach these things as approved doctrines. Rather, she asserts she was simply making further inquiry about them right alongside the people of the Boston Church.

In order to answer for her free-inquiries, Hutchinson offers literalistic Bible support for her free-thinking activities. She references the example and practices of King Solomon. She uses his spirit of free-inquiry and his characteristically speculative observations appearing in Ecclesiastes 3. 18-20 to make her case for her own practice of divergent thinking (Stiles 164)<sup>38</sup>. According to Hutchinson, the ever questioning King Solomon by his example in his Wisdom Literature book of Ecclesiastes supports the human ability and right to speculate. And in this spirit she demonstrates *how* she approaches the theological/social problems of her Colony.

---

<sup>38</sup> I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth? (Ecclesiastes 3:18-21)

In response to her, Shephard endorsed by Winthrop wishes to stymie this antinomian view which assumes that it is altogether right to ask questions of the unquestionable. To think divergently threatens the leader's control of a convergent society. So Winthrop, with Shephard as his mouthpiece, wishes to mute a woman who speaks "opinions". In the Court's mind, Hutchinson is, after all, "a very dangerous Woman [who] sow her corrupt opinions to the infection of man" (Stiles 164). And these free-thinking notions of hers cannot be allowed. In order to show their discontent with her ideas, the court literalistically reads another Bible text.

*In Order to Support their Notion that Free-Thinking in a Controlled Society is Tantamount to Sedition, the Court Reads the Bible Literalistically.* Again, on day one of her civic trial (November 1637), Anne Hutchinson is called to answer Winthrop and Cotton's accusations against her. They accuse her of being a heretic/seditionist. And they use a literalistically read Bible to justify their charges.

At first glance, their accusations against Hutchinson read like theological minutiae. But as previously discussed in Chapter Two, each of these original sixteen theological/social charges are inextricably fused with the court's desire for social control. Envisioning certain kinds of laws, deriving *en toto* from the Greater Law upon which they are based-- mostly from Bible passages devoted to Old Testament Law, or Church governance themes-- the leaders perceive their Community's Biblical Laws and legislative laws as inseparable. In this community, theology and law also operate as one, and therefore, theological heresy, sedition, and the breaking of the law are inextricably interconnected. To break a law is to heretically disregard the Bible upon which it is built. Practically speaking, this also implies how an officially approved theology expresses

itself through the laws which govern the people; and to unquestionably obey the elders' *ex cathedra* doctrine is the only acceptable option for someone living in this Colony. One's choice to do this is simply no choice at all. The only choice is to trust and obey ones 'fathers' who provide these good laws for their 'children'.

So in Winthrop's version of the trial appearing in his *Short Story*, it is no surprise that Hutchinson, a free-thinker, gets accused of being disobedient to her 'fathers' because of her questions. These are seen in the sixteen charges brought against her<sup>39</sup>.

During her civil trial Winthrop, and especially Cotton, desire that Hutchinson acknowledge her antinomian errors associated with her free-thinking. In fact, they even give her space to repent of them. When the Court asks her, "We desire therefore to know of you, whether you will justify and maintain what is laid to your charge or not?" She, declares that she is not afraid to answer for what she believes: "I am called here to answer to such things as are laid to my charge; name one of them" (*Short Story* 36).

Then the court tells her she is accused of sedition. They say that through her opinions she has encouraged those in the Colony "to transgress the Law" (Winthrop 36).

They accuse Hutchinson of not honoring the leadership of the Colony. In order to justify their point, they literalistically read words taken from Exodus 20:12. The court

---

<sup>39</sup> In Stiles' edited version of the trial transcripts, the emphasis seems to be the discussion of Hutchinson with the Court about the finer points of theology regarding the nature of the human being in its relationship to the Antinomian Controversy. Winthrop's *Story* while not ignoring theology, seems to emphasize more clearly the personality, manner, and claims of Hutchinson. Her interpretive and rhetorical patterns are often more clearly seen in the *Story*. Stiles' edited transcript while more abstract seems to focus more on theological anthropology. Winthrop reads more concretely, and more often captures the spirit of Hutchinson as she faces a broader array of questions. It is not surprising that in Welde's edited version, Winthrop, himself a literalistic transformer of Texts, portrays Hutchinson as an interpreter who operates just like he does.

accuses Hutchinson of transgressing the Fifth Commandment, a rule which “commands us to honor Father and Mother, *which includes all in authority* [italics mine]”. The court and Winthrop recast this verse’s specifically limited reference to “honoring parents” (Exodus 20:12), and by their literalist reading they cause it to refer not to one’s *natural* parents, but *patriarchally* to their own selves as the Colony’s rulers. They do not like the loss of face Hutchinson is causing for them. By offering opinions, she is guilty of casting “reproach and dishonour upon the Fathers” (*Short Story* 36). She dishonors the “Fathers of the Common-wealth” by her seditious practices embodied in her free-thinking and theological questioning, so they enforce this accusation by reading Exodus 20:12 literalistically.

But Hutchinson responds to the court. She resists their charge of sedition by citing her own literalistic reading of “honoring parents” (Exodus 20:12). Looking for a reason to refute this authoritarian requirement of theirs, she also literalistically reads for them a Biblical reference supporting her refusal to blindly obey them: “I am to obey you *only in the Lord* [italics mine]” (*Short Story* 36).

Her quoted phrase originates from the second half of Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians. Located in the practical advice section of Paul’s occasional Letter, her Text originates from a context where Paul presents the implications of his previously given theologies (Chapters 1-5) for child/ parent (6:1), father (6:4), servant (6:5-8) master (6:9), and other Christian relationships (6:10-24). Paul’s passage says:

*Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right* (italics mine). Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. (Ephesians 6:1-4)

It is possible that Hutchinson may have in view here the other companion circulatory Letter to the Colossians<sup>40</sup>. But even if this were the case, it really makes no difference for her argument before the Court. The wording of both Texts read virtually the same. In one or both contexts, Paul addresses the behaviors of little children. “Obey your fathers”, he tells the Ephesian little ones, “and be compliant out of respect for the Lord” (Colossians: 19-25 and Ephesians 6:1-24).

Through her literalistic readings, then, Hutchinson demonstrates her attitudes towards her rulers. As both a woman of her time and member of this Colony, she obviously has no problems with complying with her ‘fathers’ as long as they behave fatherly by governing her and others properly. Yet, if in their paternity she allows for them, the leaders are refusing her the right to ask questions about theological/social issues, then she considers them wrong indeed. Using her literalistic readings of Ephesians 6:1-24 she makes her point of resistance. This is an over step of their power. This is not “in the Lord” (*Short Story* 36) as she sees it.

Literalistically reading the Ephesians text, then, she uses the same kinds of literalistic and rhetorical processes the Court uses against her. She, too, clothes her

---

<sup>40</sup> Colossians 3:19-25 reads similarly to Ephesians 6:1-24. “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them. ***Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord*** (italics mine). Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged. Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service, as men pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons” (Colossians 3:19-25)



agendas in the claims of divine sanction cut out from the very fabric of the Bible they themselves use.

And again, reading as they do, she says to them:

Put case *I do fear the Lord, and my Parent do not* (Italics mine). May not I entertain one that fears the Lord, because my Father will not let me? I may put honor upon him as a Child of God (*Short Story* 36).

Reading literalistically to support her claim, Hutchinson affirms she does in principle honor her parents, the Colony's leaders. She does not deny her obligation to do this. Here once again her "parent" is in fact the colonial male leadership over her, and it seems her literalistic reading serves the purpose of demonstrating her willingness to cooperate with the patriarchy of her society. She seems to have no qualms about this. In fact, she offers her respect to them by putting "honor upon him as a Child of God" (*Short Story* 36).

Yet, through her readings of Scripture, she makes the case that both she and her followers will continue to maintain their unabashed right to ask questions about the often unquestioned ideas. She insists that she will obey her "[Heavenly] Father", and not her colonial "Parent". Based on her reading, this is both her right and her obligation. She will continue to resist her patriarchal leaders who challenge her in this regard (*Short Story* 36). Even though, the elders read the Bible literalistically to support the notion that free-thinking and expressing opinions in a controlled society is tantamount to sedition; Hutchinson will not flinch. Her literalistic reading of the Bible in response to theirs differs. A heretic and seditionist she will continue to be.

Hutchinson's statement of this conditional obedience is then followed by another one of her beliefs: the teaching role of women.

*In Order to Support their Ideas That a Woman's Teaching Role in the Colony is Limited the Court Reads the Bible Literalistically.* Not only is Hutchinson accused of being a heretic and seditionist, she is also charged with taking upon herself a role not provided for her by the Church. The court questions her on day one of the civic trial about the study groups meetings in her home. They require she prove to them that she has received their previous approvals. They want her to provide evidence that she has their authorization to conduct her private meetings which they have heard challenge the theologies associated with the preachers' sermons. "What say you to your weekly public Meetings? Can you show a warrant for them?" (*Short Story* 36).

To this Hutchinson recounts that upon her arrival in the Colony, weekly meetings for the purposes of discussing weekly homilies were actually quite common. She testifies how initially her meetings "began...with five or six.", and even though they grew "to more in future time", the leadership "tolerated [this] at the first". She remarks how in light of these practices she did not believe it wrong for her meetings to also continue (*Short Story*, 6)<sup>41</sup>

The Court responds that yes even before she arrived "there were private meetings indeed". In fact, with their approval many other meetings were taking place in various

---

<sup>41</sup> This theme reoccurs during the trial and in response she explains how during her discussion group times when we "[examine] Paul's Doctrine", "we do no more but Read the Notes of our Teachers Sermons...". She says, "We reason of them by searching the Scriptures". Claiming the uses of "reason" in her study group, she is admitting how the entire group critically evaluates the veracity of the preachers' sermons by comparing their homilies with the Scriptures themselves (*Short Story* 37)! Yet the Court believes that she does not open the Scripture to illustrate "truths delivered". Rather, she "opens [her] Teachers Points, and declare[s] his meaning, and Correct[s] wherein [she] thinks he hath failed" (*Short Story* 37). Her teacher, of course, is the revered John Cotton.

locations. Yet, they say their issue with her meetings is this. Other meetings are “not so publick and frequent as yours”. The meetings they approve “are of use for [the] increase of love, and mutual edification...” Obviously, referencing her weekly meetings where the truthfulness of the minister’s sermon is critically evaluated, they claim that her meetings “are of another nature”. Indeed, if the approved meetings of others were like hers, “they also [would be considered] evil.” The court, therefore, insists that she has “no good warrant to justifie” her get-togethers, so she must “answer by what authority or rule” she conducts them (*Short Story*, 36).

Resisting their view, Hutchinson obligates the court to allow her house meetings to continue and literalistically reads two New Testament texts to offer divine sanction for their continuance. She responds to the Court’s questions about what Colony “rule” gives her the right to conduct her meetings. She validates this claim by literalistically reading a rule found in an occasional letter written by Paul to Titus of Crete (Titus 2:1-6)<sup>42</sup>. She offers for evidence a rule from this selected passage from the Epistle which says that she as an “elder woman” has the right to “teach the younger” (*Short Story*, 36) if they are meeting in her home. And so she resists the Court’s rule with one created from her own literalistically read Bible. Through her reference of Scripture, she claims she has God’s approval to do this. She does not necessarily need the Colony’s official authorization.

---

<sup>42</sup> But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine: That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience. The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; that they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Young men likewise exhort to be sober minded. (Titus 2:1-6)

And at this point for the author of this analysis, some interesting questions arise. If Hutchinson is indeed employing a similar literalistic transformation of a Bible meaning like the one used by the court to equate “fathers” (Ephesians 6:1-4) with the Colony’s leaders; then could she also be insisting that she an ‘elder woman’ should be regarded as spiritual ‘mother’ too? I believe the answer to this question to be a qualified ‘yes’. The qualification in this case is how indeed historically, even after her banishment from Massachusetts Bay, many in Rhode Island continued to follow her as a spiritual maternal figure. In light of her literalistic reading here of Titus 2:1-6 which parallels the ‘fathers’ earlier patriarchal read of Ephesians 6:1-4; I believe it quite tenable that Hutchinson is authoritatively requiring the ‘fathers’ to also acknowledge her maternal spiritual leadership.

Regarding Hutchinson’s teaching role, the Court then uses Paul’s words to limit her influence in the community by telling her that her teaching place is in the home. They support their view with another literalistic reading of their own. This time it is a literalistically read text of Titus 2:1-6. In rebuttal of Hutchinson, they say:

So we allow you to do, as the Apostle there means, *privately, and upon occasion*[italics mine], but that gives no warrant of such set Meetings for that purpose; and besides, you take upon you to teach many that are elder than yourself, neither do you teach them that which the Apostle commands, viz. to keep at home. (*Short Story*, 36)

But in their literalistic readings of the Bible, the court also adds additional words to the words of Paul found in Titus 2:1-6. Establishing their limitations upon her teaching others, the Court tells Hutchinson that they allow her to teach “...as the Apostle there means, privately, and upon occasion....” (*Short Story* 36). But nowhere in Paul’s Text can these words be found. Practically speaking, the court rewrites the Text with the goals of

Divinely sanctioning the limitations they wish to place on her popular teaching ministry. They literalistically read Titus 2:1:6 as God's voice to legitimize what they wish to see happen. They wish to squelch Hutchinson's influence as a teacher who welcomes the opinions and questionings of colonial public.

Additionally, the court also literalistically reads from the same Text where Paul speaks about older women teaching the younger women. They tell Hutchinson she has no right to be teaching the older women, either. They claim Paul's words only endorse Hutchinson to teach "younger women" (Titus 2:1-6) or practically speaking, girls? The Court reads Paul to support their decision which forbids Hutchinson from teaching women "older" than herself (*Short Story*, 36). They use their literalistic readings of the Bible to convince and require the women of the Colony to agree with them. They say that God says it is wrong for this free-thinking Hutchinson to hold unlawful meetings, and to instruct persons she should never have been allowed to teach in the first place (*Short Story* 36).

So perhaps what is happening here is this. The Court believes that if they with divine sanction can convince Hutchinson and others that she has no right to teach older men or older women-- the most thoughtful part of the citizenry—then, her notions of free thinking and living will become a relic of a forgotten past. Her teaching ministry will cease to be a growing threat to the required uniformity of the present where convergence not divergence must be maintained.

But in defiance to their directives drawn from their 'Rule Book', Hutchinson responds with how she is not satisfied with their proofs. She asks, therefore, for an

additional, more acceptable form of Bible proof to support the silencing of her home studies: “Will you please to give me a rule against it, and I will yield?” (*Short Story*, 36).

To this the Court agrees. In order to further support their silencing agenda for her, they offer once again another literalistically read Bible text. They reply she already has “a plain rule against it”. Indeed, it is the very directive of the Apostle Paul found in I Timothy 1:12: “I permit not a woman to teach.” (*Short Story*, 36).

They literalistically read from the New Testament Epistle of First Timothy:

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. ***But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*** (italics mine). For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. (I Timothy 1:12)

In response to their insistence that I Timothy 1:12 does not allow women to teach, Hutchinson once again offers another literalistic rejoinder. In a battle of wits with the Court, she literalistically reads Paul’s Text. And as many times before she makes their literalistic approach serve her very own purposes. She essentially says to them, ‘The rule from the Book you are quoting ONLY applies to me if I am teaching men. And that is not the case.’ She appeals to the Court that indeed she has the right to be a teacher of women. “I am not teaching men” (*Short Story*, 37).

Not to be outwitted, the Court responds to Hutchinson with a scenario requiring her knowledge and application of the Bible Rule she has just read. They say: “If a Man in distress of Conscience, or other temptation, &c. should come and ask your counsel in private, might you not teach him?”

To this, Hutchinson, says “Yes” (*Short Story*, 37).

Based on their literalistic transformations of a verse which says nothing about instructing men privately, the court goes silent. They have nothing to say her about occasionally teaching men <sup>43</sup> (*Short Story* 36).

But for Hutchinson, their literalistic reading of the Biblical evidence has nothing to do with one's hormones. According to her typological readings of the Bible, it has everything to do with God's sovereign appointment.

*Hutchinson, Therefore, Reads the Bible Typologically to Support Her Prophetic Teaching Ministry.* In so many words, Hutchinson boldly pronounces how 'maleness does not necessarily a prophet make.' In order to counter the court's arguments that she as a woman has no right to be teaching men, Hutchinson introduces a Text into the proceedings and uses it to support her notion that one's gender should not be a qualification for spiritual service in the Colony. In order to prove her point that that it is indeed God who sanctions her teaching ministry, Hutchinson reads an Old Testament Prophet in a typological way to support her formerly offered literalistic readings: "It is said, *I will pour out my spirit upon your Daughters, and they shall prophesie* [italics mine], &c. If God give me a gift of Prophesie, I may use it" (*Short Story* 37). Of course, she is offering to the Court a citation from the post-exilic Prophet Joel:

And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon **all flesh** (italics mine); and your sons and **your daughters shall prophesy** (italics mine), your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and **upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit** (italics mine) And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and

---

<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, just months before this trial, Hutchinson had done exactly this. She had recently met in private with Shephard who at the time was seemingly, sincerely, inquiring about her views on theological matters. As described earlier in this chapter, he was actually attempting to entrap her.

the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call (Joel 2:28-30).

Typologically reading this prophetic Text, which Protestant Bible scholars usually read in relationship to having been fulfilled at a global festival in Jerusalem on the Jewish Day of Pentecost (33 AD), Hutchinson inserts herself into the Text as one of its typological fulfillments. She claims herself as one of its foretold female prophets about whom Joel speaks<sup>44</sup>. Reading typologically, she explicitly justifies herself to the court as God's mouthpiece. If the court still wishes to insist that she cannot teach because she is not a male, then she will typologically offer a prophetic Text which reads how God says she can. After all, says she, God not only speaks through male prophets; He also ordains female prophets. For her typological proof text, she will require the court to look closely at the typology spoken by Joel! Soon this revelatory theme will become an even bigger issue in Chapter IV during her ecclesiastical trial. In fact, a prophetic revelation like this will eventually cause the court to finally banish her from the Bay Colony.

Of course, there has to be a response by the court. So they respond in a cessationist<sup>45</sup> way to the theology and text which Hutchinson uses to justify her Divine appointment as a prophetess. In essence, they read the Bible literalistically in order to say to her, 'The church does not need you or your prophetic teaching ministry!' Also reading

---

<sup>44</sup> Luke the Evangelist in his New Testament "Acts of the Apostles (2:1-38)" sees the promise of the outpoured Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost as being the promised fulfillment of Joel 2:28-29 involving not just one person but many nations, men, women, young and old.

<sup>45</sup> Cessationism is a theological view which says that since the miraculous gifts of the early Church are no longer needed for today, they no longer happen. They have ceased, Hence, the term 'cessationism'.



Joel's prophecy (Joel 2:28-30) as it appears in the Book of the Acts (Acts 2:1-38), the court claims that prophetic utterances were needed only during the apostolic age. They dismiss her typological reading by saying, "The Apostle applies that Prophecy unto those extraordinary times, and the gifts of Miracles and Tongues, were common to many, as well as the gift of Prophecy" (*Short Story* 37). In other words, since the Apostles are no longer living among the Bay Colony Puritans, it is neither possible nor desirable to expect the gift of prophecy which Hutchinson is claiming for herself. Denying the theological likelihood of her supposed prophetic gift authentically operating within the Colony, the Court responds with a literalistically read Bible text which they intend will severely contain her growing antinomian influence. They tell her "In teaching your children, you exercise your gift of Prophecy and that within your calling" (*Short Story* 37).

For the Court, the gift of prophecy has ceased, and so should Hutchinson's claim of possessing it. Furthermore, if she is a prophet truly speaking God's words, then this potentially obligates the Colony to do what she claims God tells them. In this scenario, the Colony would be forced to obey her and not the elders. And this proves very uncomfortable for the leaders in charge. What if what God prophetically speaks through this prophet and requires action from the Colony in diametric opposition to what the leaders wish? Who wins?

This is perhaps the most comical and illogical moment of this civic trial. In conclusion to this discussion about Hutchinson's prophetic gift; the court based on their literalistic readings of Scripture through their lenses of cessationist theology, tells Hutchinson that even though her claimed gift of prophecy has ceased, she can always use

this currently non-existent gift to teach her children! This is certainly within her calling (*Short Story* 37). “In teaching your children, you exercise your gift of Prophesie, and that within your calling” (*Short Story* 37).

So then, as has been seen, when the leaders literalistically and typologically read the Bible, they subjugate women and their teaching roles within the church. Yet, when Hutchinson reads in the same ways, she removes these gender limitations. When Hutchinson reads typologically, she also uses the Bible to support the prophetic teaching ministry of women. And so this struggle for dominance continues, and now with another issue.

*In Order to Support Their Ideas of Female Subjugation, the Leadership Reads the Bible Literalistically to Claim that She Should be Subject to her Husband.* Before the first day of the civic trial of November 1637 concludes until the next day, the interrogators demand one more answer from Hutchinson about her claimed teaching ministry. They have already read Scripture in an attempt to limit her public instruction, her prophesying, and her engagement with others in open-ended discussions about the Bible. Now they return to an earlier argument. The Court declares once again how she has absolutely no right to teach men. To this Hutchinson responds that she has the right to be “publick instructor, and she cites a Bible proof-text as evidence (*Short Story* 37).

This time she responds to the court by literalistically reading from a smaller passage appearing in the narrative of Acts of the Apostles (18:26-28). This narrative describes a man called Apollos, a recent convert who had begun teaching the story of Jesus. A neophyte to the Faith, Apollos reportedly lacks a mature understanding of the Holy Spirit. Priscilla and her husband Aquila upon meeting Apollos decide to instruct

him in the finer points of doctrine. As a result of their lessons, he comes to a fuller understanding of the Faith and so begins teaching others more effectively. The passage from the Acts which Hutchinson literalistically reads is Acts 18, especially verse 26-28.

In light of this Text Hutchinson offers to the Court that a woman can indeed have an effective teaching ministry. Reading literalistically she offers Priscilla's teaching ministry for proof: "Here is my authority, Aquila and Priscilla took upon them to instruct Apollo more perfectly." She reads the story and concludes how "Aquila and Priscilla...being better instructed" taught him (*Short Story 37*)

But wishing to debunk her theory that a woman has any right to teach men, the court reads the same Bible Text in the same literalistic way yet makes it say something totally different. They say to Hutchinson:

See how your argument stands..., Priscilla with her husband  
took Apollo home to instruct him privately, therefore  
Mistress Hutchison, without her Husband, might teach sixty or eighty...  
You show us not a rule. (*Short Story 37*)

The Court, literalistically reading the same Text for evidence, says that Priscilla and Apollo taught one person. In order to silence her solo teaching ministry, their reading emphasizes how Priscilla *never* taught by herself, or apart from her husband's guiding presence. Hutchinson apart from her husband's supervision is erring, and she is teaching not just one but sixty or eighty! In fact, Winthrop and others fear that this has been "reported abroad" in England (*Short Story 38*).

This part of the interrogation then concludes with Hutchinson speaking about how she has literalistically read the Text and offered it for proof: "I have given you two places of Scripture" which endorse what I do." And to this the Court comments:

“But neither of them will suit your practice” (*Short Story 37*).

In a final and feisty moment, Hutchinson responds to the Court that she has already given them the Bible’s rules supporting what she does (*Short Story 37*). She repeats a former argument. Based once again on her typological reading of Joel 2:28-30, she again claims her ministry to be anti-typical. It is the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. She is a Divinely appointed prophet in an age where gender alone, or subjugation to one’s husband in this respect, does not qualify one to teach. In essence, she believes, based on her typological readings of Joel 2:28-39, how ‘rules were made to be broken’. In fact, based on her literalistic evidence, she concludes that it is actually necessary for her to break one of the court’s laws. She says if she were to refuse to do a “public Ministry”, then she herself would be break[ing] the rule” by not “exercising a gift of Prophecy” (*Short Story 38*). She would have to answer to God and not the court for refusing to do what he knows to be right.

*An Interlude: The Literalist, Typological, and Allegorical Uses of Scripture*  
*Beginning Day Two of the Civic Trial, November 1637.* Before this chapter concludes with a ‘reading of the readings’ of day two, the author would like to pause momentarily and briefly compare and contrast the ways the Bible is literalistically, typologically, and allegorically read in the transcripts of the trial.

On day two of the civic trial something very noticeable begins to happen as regards the ways the Bible is read by the Court and Hutchinson. For example, when the trial begins on day one of the civic trial, seemingly the preferred readings of the Bible are most often literalistic. The use of allegorical or typological readings and their connections with the agendas of all seem to be secondarily used. For example, in Stiles’ *Transcript*

and Winthrop's *Short Story*, the author of this analysis notes how on the first day of the civic trial (November 1637), there are at least twelve occasions where meanings of the Bible are literalistically read to establish some rhetorical purpose <sup>46</sup>. Yet, during the first day of the civic trial, the Text is only read three times in typological/anti-typological ways <sup>47</sup>.

However, on day two of the civic trial (March 16, 1637), the literalistic use of the Bible to acquit or accuse seems to occur less often. As emotions associated with the conflict begin to reach their fever pitch, the use of allegorical interpretive readings seem to predominate. The author has seen that in Winthrop's transcript, when the persuasive moment is emotionally its hottest, the tendency of the Court and Hutchinson is to NOT read literalistically. In fact, this maneuver happens only twice<sup>48</sup>. On day two of the civic trial, the primary use of the Bible is allegorical (two times)<sup>49</sup>, or perhaps, typological/anti-typical (four times)<sup>50</sup>.

Specifically, the author also sees other interesting patterns of use. On day one of the civic trial, whenever there is a specific course of action to be taken, the trial's participants read literalistically in order to illustrate the court's belief that God Himself

---

<sup>46</sup> These Bible passages used literalistically have already been noted and discussed in this chapter. They include these passages: Ephesian 4:14; II Peter 3:17; II Thessalonians 3:13; Acts 5; I Timothy 5:17-19; Hebrews 4:12-16; Ecclesiastes 3:18-20; Exodus 20:12; Ephesians 6:1-4; Colossians 3:19-24; Titus 2: 1-6; I Timothy 1:12; Acts 17: 10-14; Acts 18:26-28.

<sup>47</sup> Revelation 17:1,15,16; Revelation 19:2; Joel 2:28-30

<sup>48</sup> Matthew 5:33; I John 4:3; Ephesians 1

<sup>49</sup> Isaiah 46:12,13; Genesis 3

<sup>50</sup> Isaiah 30:20; Jeremiah 46; Isaiah 8:9; Daniel 6

legalistically sanctions their specific decisions. For example, in Winthrop's *Short Story*, Exodus 20:12 is upheld as Divine validation supporting the patriarchal leadership of the colony who require its citizens to unconditionally obey them (36).

However, on day two of the civic trial, it seems that when a Bible Text is read allegorically, it is often used to support and illustrate certain behaviors which the court wishes to imply as Divine sanction. For example, an allegorical depiction of the story of the seduction "by means of a woman" told in Genesis 3 serves John Cotton's illustrative purpose for the court illustrating his point that Hutchinson is exerting a negative influence by teaching in the colony (*Short Story* 42). This supports the point he literalistically made earlier.

Again, on day two of the civic trial, the Bible is also read typologically when it involves one's own sense of divine destiny. Hutchinson especially prefers this method of reading Scripture when she argues for her divine appointment as a prophet to the Colony (Isaiah 30:20; Jeremiah 46; Isaiah 8:9; Daniel 6), or perhaps the Bay Colony's obligation to listen and to treat her kindly (*Short Story* 40).

Hutchinson uses literalistic and allegorical and typological readings of the Biblical Text to defend herself as well as to confront her accusers. She uses literalism to defend herself by providing for the Court the "rule" for her practices (*Short Story* 37); typological readings to establish God's sanction for her ministry; and allegory when she especially wishes to colorfully illustrate the specifics of what she believes. As will be seen here now, the preferences for Hutchinson's allegorical readings can be clearly seen in the second day of the civic trial. In this spirit of allegory Hutchinson verifies her calling as a prophet.

*In Order to Support Her View That There Are False Ministers in the Motherland and Implicitly the Colony, Hutchinson Reads the Bible Allegorically and Typologically.*

On day two of the trial, Winthrop records how Hutchinson begins “to speak her mind, to tell of the manner of God's dealing with her, and how He revealed himself to her, and made her know what she had to do”. In fact, Winthrop tries to interrupt her in order to maintain order in the court “...but seeing her very unwilling” to be contained, he permitted her to proceed (*Short Story* 39).

In order to establish her Divine credentials for being a prophet to the Colony, and her testimony of having been called to be one while living in England, Hutchinson reads the Bible typologically. She first recounts her troubles in “Old England”, and how she “was much troubled at the Constitution of the Churches there”. She traces how she was so desperate for change, that she was almost ready to join the Separatist movement. Observing a very typical Puritan practice, she says she “set apart a day for humiliation”. She tells how she sought by herself “direction from God”, and how during that day of humiliation “God then [did] discover unto me the unfaithfulness of the Churches, and the danger of them, and that none of those Ministers could Preach the Lord Jesus aright” (*Short Story* 40).

In order to substantiate her claim about the unacceptable ministers in England, Hutchinson typologically then reads the First Epistle of John 4:3:

And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and *this is that spirit of antichrist* [italics mine], whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. (I John 4:3).

In her typological reading, Hutchinson proclaims the prophetic “spirit of antichrist” as already being in her world. In fact, she reads the Text’s abstract and

intangible “spirit of antichrist” as something very tangible. As Hutchinson reads it, Antichrist is a person. Reading typologically, she declares to the Court that the singular “spirit of antichrist” is actually a plural. Religiously and culturally she reads and then identifies the prophesied “spirit of antichrist” with “the Protestants”, “the Papists”, or quite possibly the “Turks” (*Short Story* 39).

Claiming Divine insight given to her by God through an immediate revelation, she like John Cotton her teacher, connects another Text with her previous I John 4:3. This time it is the allegorical passage of Hebrews 9:15-17: “He that denies the Testament, denies the death of the Testator”<sup>51</sup> (*Short Story* 39). Reading this allegory to substantiate that it is a serious thing for the Court to disallow her claim of God speaking to her, Hutchinson concludes and says to them that indeed “the Ministers of England” are these Antichrists” (*Short Story*)<sup>52</sup>.

---

<sup>51</sup> “Hebrews 9:15-17 reads “And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. *For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator* [Italics mine] For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.”

<sup>52</sup> Cotton typically reads Scripture by first examining a Text, then collating its meaning with the meanings of other previously read Texts, and then finally synchronizing the results of all to finally formulate his own interpretation. See Davidson, Edward H. "John Cotton's Biblical Exegesis: Method and Purpose." *Early American Literature* 1982: 119-38. Hutchinson seems also to be using this three step method of Biblical analysis used by her teacher John Cotton. For a fuller demonstration of how Cotton and Hutchinson use a three-fold method consisting of examination, collation, and synchrony interpret Bible Texts, see my comparative reading of Hutchinson's and Cotton's hermeneutics. Carolyn Baker “Anne Hutchinson: Not Guilty!” in Selected Proceedings on the Northern Plains conference on Early British Literature, April 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2012 held at Northern State University, Aberdeen South Dakota.



Using her allegorical and typological readings of the Bible to try to convince her hearers that she has inside information on the spirituality of others, Hutchinson leaves an unspoken accusation hanging in the air. It is this. If truly England's ministers are false, then what does this imply about those former England ministers who are presently serving the Colony? Are they not from England?

Not surprisingly, this heated rhetoric leads to an assertion which gets again validated by another allegorical and typological reading of Scripture.

*In Order to Support Her View That the Colony Deserves God's Divine Judgment Hutchinson Reads the Bible Allegorically and Typologically.* On day two of the trial, Winthrop records how in the final moments of her testimony, Hutchinson collates one final piece of typological evidence with the texts previously mentioned. Working synchronistically, she uses her most forceful typological proof to predict a forthcoming judgment upon the Colony's leaders<sup>53</sup>. For the final time during the civic trial she places herself in the prophetic tradition, declaring:

I will give you one place more, which the Lord brought to me by immediate Revelations, and that doth concern you all; it is in Dan. 6. When the Presidents and Princes could find nothing against him, because he was faithful, they sought matter against him concerning the Law of his God, to cast him into the Lions' den. (*Short Story* 41)

---

<sup>53</sup> Cotton and the Court understand the implications of Hutchinson's typological language. Interpreting Hutchinson's words, Cotton says later: "Daniel must be a Type of Mistress Hutchison, the Lion's Den of the Court of Justice, and the Presidents and Princes of the reverend Elders here, and all must sort to this conclusion, she must be delivered by Miracle, and all we must be ruined...She vented her Impatience with so fierce Speech and Countenance, as one would hardly have guessed her to have been an Antitype of Daniel, but rather of the Lions after they were let loose" (*Short Story* 42).

Of course, because this Text has been ‘opened’ to her by God, she justifies herself as typologically standing in the prophetic and persecuted tradition of Daniel (Daniel 6:22-24). She collates and typologically reads the Texts which God has ‘opened’ to her with Isaiah 46:12, 13; Isaiah 30:20; Jeremiah 46:28; Isaiah 8:9). Asserting the Divine authority of a deliverance which Daniel knew, she predicts judgment upon the Colony since they dare challenge the work she has been sent to do. They will be judged for interfering with her calling to lead and liberate the people in their rights to question and to think. Having experienced the Divine revelation through the reading and ‘opening’ of many Texts; and having finally collated all her Texts; she makes a final synchronization. With one final persuasive move she says to the court on the second and final day of her civic trial:

so it was revealed to me, that they should plot against me, but the Lord bid me not to fear, for he that delivered Daniel, and the Three Children, his hand was not shortened. And see this Scripture fulfilled this day in mine eyes, therefore take heed what ye go about to do unto me, for you have no power over my body, neither can you do me any harm, for I am in the hands of the Eternal Jehovah my Saviour, I am at his appointment, the bounds of my habitation are cast in Heaven, no farther do I esteem of any mortal Man, than creatures in his hand; I fear none but the great Jehovah, which hath foretold me of these things; and I do verily believe that he will deliver me out of your hands, therefore take heed how you proceed against me; for I know that for this you go about to do to me, God will ruin you and your Posterity, and this whole State (*Short Story* 40).

And so the first and the second day of Hutchinson’s civic trial concludes. Based on Hutchinson’s synchrony of allegorically and typologically read Texts, she concludes reminding the Court that they must careful about what they intend to do to her. The interrogation of day two concludes with John Cotton reading Ephesians 1:17.

Literalistically, claiming how the Bible will not support such independent revelations as Hutchinson’s, approved revelations are directly related to the understanding of the

Scriptures, and nothing else, says he<sup>54</sup>. Hutchinson's supposed revelations of being delivered from the penalties of her actions as Daniel was are indeed bogus. They are in fact "Satanical, and tending to much danger" (*Short Story* 42).

Furthermore, according to Cotton, Hutchinson has "manifested, that her Opinions and Practice have been the cause of all our Disturbances". He concludes with the court's opinion. She is guilty of sedition. "She [has] walked by such a rule as cannot stand with the Peace of any State". Resorting, in these emotionally charged moments, to the use of a Bible example, he declares that "at no time in ages past has ever so many wise, sober, and well-grounded Christians, [been] so suddenly seduced by the means of a Woman" (*Short Story* 42). Hutchinson is an Eve who is seducing the Colony.

So on a cold day In November 1637 after a two day trial, with an unofficial, private meeting sandwiched in between the two official days of it, the court excommunicates a physically weakened Hutchinson. And this comes with a promise of a future banishment.

The Court saw now an inevitable necessity to rid her away, except we would be guilty, not only of our own ruin, but also of the Gospel: so in the end the Sentence of Banishment was pronounced against her, and she was committed to the Marshal, till the Court should dispose of her. (*Short Story* 4)

Almost six months later on March 17, 1638 she will be tried ecclesiastically to be officially banished forever from the community

### **Chapter Conclusion**

---

<sup>54</sup> Ephesians 1:17 reads: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him

This chapter has explained some specific agendas of Hutchinson, Winthrop, and Cotton seen during her ecclesiastical trial of November 1637, and especially how the Bible was read to support the invocative rhetoric of all. Mindful of the ways Winthrop and Cotton often read the Bible to support their agendas (Chapter II), this chapter examined the transcripts of the civic trial looking for these same kinds of rhetorical patterns. As a result of ‘reading their readings’, the author isolated what she perceived as the major agendas fueling the ways the Bible was read and the trial conducted. The author focused on the ways these selected agendas used the Bible as a means of validation, and the ways the Bible was used fuel the mutual struggles for dominance by Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson.

Specifically, in this chapter the author showed how the leaders read the Bible to validate their desire to protect and preserve the reputations of its Colony rulers; how they used the Bible as a ‘Rule Book’ to rule the Colony, and how they read the Biblical Text to Divinely sanction their desire to justify their means of entrapping the accused. Seen also on this chapter were the ways the Bible was literalistically read to prove that free-thinking is tantamount to sedition; or how that women, Hutchinson particularly, should be subjugated to their husbands.

Again, in this chapter, the author showed how Hutchinson also used the Bible to gain support for her views and agendas; how that she read the Bible literalistically to support her ideas of free-thinking; or how she read in typological or allegorical ways to validate her prophetic teaching ministry. She also read allegorically and typologically to support her view of False ministers in the Colony, and that the Colony deserves God’s judgment.

## CHAPTER IV

### **WINTHROP, COTTON, AND HUTCHINSON'S LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF MEANING IN THE COLONY'S PROTESTANT BIBLE AND THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S ECCLESIASTICAL TRIAL (MARCH 15 1638)**

#### **Introduction**

As just seen, the literalistic, allegorical, and typological readings of the Bible and their accompanying rhetorical uses by Winthrop and Cotton are also those of Anne Hutchinson herself during her civic trial (November 1637). The author will continue demonstrating how these individuals use the Bible literalistically, allegorically, and typologically to resist each other in their mutual struggles for dominance. She will also continue showing synoptically how their rhetorical uses of the Bible to validate their agendas are seen in at least two primary sources for the trials: John Winthrop's *Short Story* edited by Thomas Welde, and the *Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* edited by Ezra Stiles.

#### **The Colony's Charges against Hutchinson and the Literalistic Use of the Bible**

According to Winthrop's *Short Story*, the second part of Hutchinson's interrogation of the ecclesiastical trial begins on March 15, 1638. Yet some time before the ecclesiastical trials of March 15 1638, Hutchinson had been placed under house

arrest. As a result of her previous civic trials, Hutchinson is “banished and confined, till the season of the year might be fit, and safe for her departure” (*Short Story* 48). Yet, this never prevents her followers from continuing to meet with her to discuss Biblical/theological and social issues. According to Winthrop, during these meetings “Satan made choice opportunity” to use a “fit instrument...to attain his mischievous end in darkening the saving truth of the Lord Jesus.” In his *Short Story*, Winthrop reports to his readers how he believes Hutchinson’s meetings were the way Satan “disturbed the peace of [God’s] Churches”; for during these meetings she and many of her followers continue discussing speculative “questions about the Immortality of the Soul, about the Resurrection, about the Morality of the Sabbath, and divers others [issues]” (48).

So in spite of or because of her house arrest, Hutchinson’s popularity actually increases. She continues to persuade others that thinking and asking questions about sacred things and their relationship to life is both right and necessary. Winthrop says that because of this “the Elders of Boston declared their readiness to deal with Mistress Hutchinson in a Church-way, if they had sufficient testimony” (*Short Story* 48). And testimony they find. The elders gather reports from many witnesses. They cite views as heard “from her own Mouth several times”; and the Church of Boston with permission of the magistrates sends for Hutchinson “the prisoner” to appear before them on March 15, 1638, a Lecture-Day (*Short Story* 48).

Hutchinson, experiencing “bodily infirmity”, arrives at the church, and a “Ruling Elder” calls her to stand “before the Assembly, (which was very great from all the parts

of the Country)”<sup>55</sup>. As this august group proceeds to present to Hutchinson “why the Church had called her” (*Short Story* 48), they read to her a list of theological charges. They also ask her if she would like to recant any of her beliefs <sup>56</sup>.

As Hutchinson listens she hears a list of theologically worded charges. All of them are the results of having read the Bible literalistically. Of the twenty-four accusations against Hutchinson, Winthrop alone records at least eight literalistically read Bible Texts which are used in some way by both Hutchinson, Winthrop and Cotton during the banishment proceedings: Ecclesiastes 3:18, I Corinthians 6:19, I Corinthians 15:44, John 5:28, John 17:21, Matthew 18:3, Genesis 22, Romans 3:27, and John 15. A literalistic reading of the Bible can also be inferred from the theological wording of the other remaining sixteen charges.

Before specifically focusing on how some of the aforementioned Bible texts are literalistically read in this battle of wits, the author would like to briefly show how some of the more significant social/theological charges of the Court against Hutchinson often

---

<sup>55</sup> According to Stiles’ edited version of the trial, “Elders of this Church” and “the Elders of other Churches”; indeed, those all those making up “the Face of the Country” were gathered at the trial both to hear and offer their testimonies (*The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 180). The audience was also filled with “sisters of our own congregation” and those “sisters” of other congregations (*The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 170).

<sup>56</sup> Unlike Winthrop’s account edited by Welde, Stiles’ edited version records two separate lists of charges. According to Stiles, the first list of nine accusations originate from a Mr. Shephard and a Mr. Frost; while the seven remaining complaints in Stiles’ transcript originate from a Mr. Wells and a Mr. Eliott who come from “Roxberrie”. In addition to the sixteen charges which Stiles’ edited transcript records as having been given on the first day of the Civic trial (*Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 163-4), Welde’s edited trial contains Winthrop’s list for that same day includes eight additional indictments causing the final collection of charges to total twenty-four (*Short Story* 48).

use a literalistically read Bible for their validation. As mentioned previously in Chapter II, the court's accusations against her might seem to read like theological minutiae. Yet, once again, the author believes that these socio-political charges coated in theological language either implicitly or explicitly reference a previously read Biblical Text for their source. And related to all of this is an agenda serving some subjugating and silencing purpose. As seen in Chapter III, for Hutchinson, a charge of heresy is the same thing as sedition. She is accused of beliefs which could inevitably lead to anarchy. When the Court uses theology, the servant of an indirectly or directly used Bible, to validate their indictments against her, she returns the favor and resists their attempts to dominate her and her mission.

Once again the idea of control surfaces.

*The Colony Leaders Fear that Hutchinson is using a Theology to Override Their Continuing Control of its Citizens.* In charge number two, the court accuses Hutchinson of promoting, through her discussion groups, inappropriate views regarding the human soul. The elders inculcate her of endorsing among her followers a heresy which says, "That in regard of Christ's purchase, they are immortal, so that Christ purchased the Souls of the wicked to eternal pain, and the Souls of the elect to eternal peace". In response to Hutchinson's teachings probably based on her literalistic readings; the court says she has been teaching that some humans are destined to eternal bliss, and others to eternal torment. The "souls of the elect" will enjoy "eternal peace", while the 'Souls of the wicked' will endure "eternal pain" (*Short Story* 48). They accuse her of believing in the eternal pre-determination of human souls as irrevocably set in stone by God. And this has great social implications for the Colony.



Explicitly their charge against Hutchinson reads simply as an accusation about a heresy which she holds about a theology involving life in the world to come. On the surface, the language of eternal bliss and eternal torment seems to refer to another dimension, certainly not about life in March 1638. What is so heretical about this doctrine of eternal bliss or damnation which the Church universal has held for centuries? The court considers this topic for discussion as heretical, and even seditious. Why?

The author believes that for the Court, Hutchinson is doing more than simply questioning the view of 'pre-destination', a common belief discussed by a Calvinist of her day. Through her supposed theological statement and dialogs with other citizens, the court understands her to be implicitly questioning who is really in control of the Colony. The Court is apparently calling Hutchinson a heretic because she is holding open discussions about God's sovereign choice to save or damn His creatures. If, as the court probably believes, she is saying that all which concerns humans is fatalistically determined by God; then this theology probably has big social and political consequences for those who would rule the Colony. This means that God, *not* human beings, is in charge of the eternal state of souls, and especially those living in the Colony. If God is truly the Supreme Ruler, then Hutchinson is implicitly maintaining that the elders are not in total control of this world, and especially the Church and the Colony they solely wish to govern. If this be true, then she is being accused of using a theology to undercut their leadership.

And there is also another charge.

*The Colony Leaders Fear that Hutchinson is using a Theology to Prevent Citizens from Attempting to Do What the Elders Consider as Right and Good.* The court claims

that Hutchinson is discussing with citizens that: “There is no such thing as inherent righteousness” (*Short Story* 62); and that “Sanctification can be no evidence at all of our good estate” (*Short Story* 63). Like the theological charges just previously discussed, these indictments reflect a kind of Calvinistic belief. Explicitly such a theology claims that human beings are totally depraved. In Calvinistic theology this normally means that all persons are constitutionally incapable of doing good. They have no “inherent righteousness” (*Short Story* 62) just as Hutchinson is claiming here.

Once again, on the surface this theological charge presents Hutchinson teaching heretically about a citizen’s standing before God. But why would a theology, this time about justification, be considered heretical and seditious? And why would Hutchinson be called before the court to answer for her questions and statements about justifications?

The author believes this has everything to do with the social implications of said doctrine. If, as Hutchinson teaches, all citizens are totally depraved; and if these humans cannot be expected to do any good; then her discussions with citizens about this idea potentially poses huge implications for the Colony’s social order. If as Hutchinson affirms citizens are incapable of doing any good, and that sanctification does not reflect a redeemed state; then what would be citizens’ motivation to attempt to do the defined good their leaders certainly require of them? The author believe this is alarming to the Court because Hutchinson is using her opinion about a theology derived implicitly in part from the Bible to lessen the Colony’s requirements for living good lives as they define it.

This is also implied in a related charge. Just as previously discussed in Chapter III, Hutchinson is again formally charged with holding to a heretical view of the soul. This view is explicitly related to the way she literalistically reads Ecclesiastes 3:18, a

Wisdom Literature text written by speculative King Solomon. Reading this Text Hutchinson claims that: “the Souls of all Men (in regard of generation) are mortal like the Beasts, Eccles. 3. 18” (*Short Story* 63).

But as before, why might this belief be considered by the Court to be a heresy/sedition? Once again, Hutchinson seems to be making an explicit statement about the human condition: human nature is mortal. She is saying that like beasts, humans can live only according to their own instincts. Humans can only live behavioristically, as it were. Hutchinson’s theology affirms that humans are mortal not immortal as regards their natures. This naturally implies that that they have no eternal future which extends beyond this life. But why would this speculation read literalistically into Ecclesiastes 3:18 cause so much distress?

Perhaps it could be this. If it is true that Hutchinson is expressing her opinions to citizens that “the souls of all men are mortal like beasts”, colonial leaders are probably worried that she is suggesting a very earth bound, limited view of the human beings they rule. If the court accepts her view that the “souls of all men are mortal like beasts” (*Short Story* 61); then what becomes of their insistence that all subjects must conduct themselves according to a higher Law—the one which they interpret and endorse? Beasts, obviously, are unable to exhibit a higher sense of responsibility, or a conscious moral regard for higher Law.

Implicitly residing in this heresy is also a sedition. If the essential moral core of colonists is like beasts, then those duped into believing this antinomian theology may one day aspire to live like brutes. The Court fears their loss of power over the people. They dread that their view of noble, loyal, and loving human responsibility—one constructed

from their official readings of the Bible-- will be replaced by an individual's sole regard for himself, and not necessarily for the good of others in the Colony.

This same kind of thinking seems to be associated with another related charge. This one says: "There are no created graces in the human nature of Christ, but he was only acted by the power of the God-head" (Short Story 48)<sup>57</sup>. Once again, the social implications of this theologically coated social charge becomes the ingredients for a potential uprising. Hutchinson's theology has major implications for all the purported Christ' Followers comprising the Colony. If, as Hutchinson maintains, that there is no goodness to be found in Christ' human nature; then likewise, she might also be teaching that no goodness can be expected to reside in the human natures of those Christian citizens who share in His humanity, too. If the only reason Christ is good is because He is God, then what are the implications for colonists who are not good, only human, and not God? Presumably, since colonists are not good or God, they cannot be expected to accomplish the good their leaders require of them.

Perhaps this is exactly what their rulers fear? Citizens who can only hope to do bad will actually end up doing so. The Court is, therefore, probably concerned that thinking citizens will use this heresy as an excuse to justify their refusal to keep the laws taught by their leaders. This, the author believes, is the implied court's concern about Hutchinson's theological statements. Hutchinson through her opinions expressed

---

<sup>57</sup> Winthrop's Charge Number Seven corresponds with Charge Number Five in Stiles' transcript: "That there be no created graces in the human nature of Ch: nor in Believers after Union" (*Trial of Mrs. Hutchinson* 163). Hutchinson is also accused of discussing with citizens: "That so far as Man is in union with Christ, he can do no duties perfectly" (*Short Story* 63).

theologically is using her home studies to not just discuss divergent ideas, but to sow seeds of discontent which will result in a social uprising.

There is also another theological charge against Hutchinson which, the author believes, inextricably binds free thinking about Scripture and theology with anarchy's potential.

*The Colony Leaders Fear that Hutchinson is using a Theology to Encourage the Powerful and Growing Collective Voice of the People.* The court accuses Hutchinson that “She had no Scripture to warrant that Christ's Manhood is now in Heaven, but the body of Christ is his Church” (*Short Story* 48)<sup>58</sup>. This charge, of course, relates to the nature of the Colony's Church. Hutchinson is accused of promoting heresies regarding the “Body of Christ”. They accuse her of dangerously redefining the nature of the Church. Drawn most likely from an allegory which the Apostle Paul first uses in the First Epistle of Corinthians 12 to designate the Corinthian congregation's collective experience of spiritual gifts, Hutchinson recasts the Biblical allegory to teach how Christ collectively lives and expresses Himself on earth through His earth bound members called His Body. In this case, it is the Boston Church. Through her theological statement, Hutchinson seems to be doing more than explicitly expressing the mystical relationship of the Son to His own. Rather, she is implicitly encouraging her own to think how Christ speaks, acts, guides, and directs not just through a select few but His Body collective, the *entire* Boston Church.

---

<sup>58</sup> Winthrop's charge number nine corresponds with Stiles charge number eight: “That there is no Kingdom of Heaven, but Christ Jesus” (*The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 163).

It is not hard to see why the court would view this theological allegory as dangerous. They probably understand Hutchinson to be saying how it is not simply the elders who speak for God. They see her as saying that God speaks through the *entire* Church, and not just to and through its official leadership. If it is indeed the Body of Christ through whom God speaks, acts, guides, and directs, then this means that Christ's immediate presence leads *all* by expressing Himself through the community's shared sense of vision and consensus. Hutchinson by even discussing this idea of the Body of Christ with her study groups is introducing seeds of dissent. The court fears that her expressed theology is implicitly calling for an enlarged sense of democratic rule within this Bible Commonwealth. And this is antinomian to their ears.

And in a much related way, Hutchinson also claims God speaks through her to the community. She perceives herself as a spokesperson for God. According to Winthrop, Hutchinson is also charged with the heresy of insisting:

That her particular revelations about future events are as infallible as any part of Scripture, and that she is bound as much to believe them, as the Scripture, for the same Holy Ghost is the Author of them both. (*Short Story* 63)<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> The court indicts Hutchinson for believing "That her particular revelations about future events are as infallible as any part of Scripture, and that she is bound as much to believe them, as the Scripture, for the same Holy Ghost is the Author of them both" (*Short Story* 63). Of course, just as Hutchinson critic Michael Dittmore shows in his article, "A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson's 'Immediate Revelation'", Hutchinson's "immediate revelations" are possibly best understood as directly related to her Divinely granted and personal insights about Scripture, a phenomenon which the later Quakers called the 'inner light'. According to Dittmore, this indeed is the definition of 'immediate revelations' which John Cotton her teacher believed and taught her. 'Immediate revelations' as described in one of his 1636 sermons, *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace*, is where "the Spirit comes in the mouth of the Word, and of the Word in the mouth of the Spirit the Spirit of God will speak *Scripture* to you" (177). In the very likely understanding of Dittmore, Cotton "conflate[ed] the static text and the Spirit's movement" ("Prophetess in Her Own Country" 353).

As already seen in Chapter III, Hutchinson often typologically reads Old Testament prophecy in ways to support her claim that she and her life experiences in the Colony are fulfillments of Bible prophecy. For example, as seen there she reads Joel 2:28-30 to support her view that God speaks through *all* His people, and especially her. By implication here of course, the Court understands her to be saying that God does *not* just speak through the magistrates who lead the Colony. God speaks through her. And by believing and observing this practice within with her home Bible study groups, Hutchinson is elevating the role of the common person. By so doing, she is implicitly demoting the role of the Elders who claim they solely speak for God. For the court, this obviously causes the ground to become much too level for all. If others in the Colony have more power and freedom to rule themselves, what does this do to the Leader's control of the people?

Ultimately, if all in the Colony have an authoritative voice, and not just the elders; then this heretical teaching becomes seditious as it threatens the Elder's claim to position, power, and prestige. Public discussions like these endanger the very continuance of the social order the court has always enjoyed and still envisions. The Court fears Hutchinson is citing theology in order to incite the Colony. And there is yet another problem the court has with Hutchinson's views.

*The Colony Leaders Fear that Hutchinson is using a Theology to Encourage the the Loss of an Objective Standard of Right and Wrong.* The Court also charges that Hutchinson is discussing a heresy concerning the "Kingdom of Heaven". Winthrop's *Short Story* records how the court accuses her of teaching: "There is no Kingdom of Heaven in Scripture, but only Christ" (*Short Story* 48).

But why would this seemingly harmless theology be considered a heresy?

Explicitly it seems to be so other-worldly. On a surface level this teaching seems to have little relevance for daily life in the Colony. But maybe not. If the court hears Hutchinson claiming that the “Kingdom of Heaven” is a Divine realm where Christ alone in the here and now mystically rules a volitionally free people called His Church; then implicitly the Leader’s interpretation of the Law is not altogether necessary. They alone do not have all the answers. A mystical Christ does; and the Boston Colony people who are members of the “kingdom of heaven” where Christ rules do, too.

Here the Court is probably finding objectionable how Hutchinson is questioning what kind of law colonists should obey. The Court probably fears she is saying that in its governance, leaders must allow the public to create their own policies which reflect their ideas about what the “Kingdom of Heaven” on earth in Boston Colony looks like. If so, then it is easy to see how this heresy could also be so easily connected with a charge of sedition; for this heresy implicitly consists of Hutchinson and her group discussing new ways the Colony should be governed. This is yet another social implications behind Hutchinson’s theological claim.

Again, it is quite possible that the court also fears Hutchinson is affirming that truth for the life of the public is existential, relational, and not propositional. If this is true, then there are significant implications for the leadership who officially interpret the Law. If they accept what Hutchinson proposes that “there is no Kingdom of Heaven” which operates solely according to the elder’s objective, black and white understandings; and if as a result there is only the subjective, multi-colored, relational ones of “Christ”; then elders would find it very difficult to enforce their “Law” which they represent as



entirely objective, unidirectional, and propositional (*Short Story* 48). If this is the motivating energy behind Hutchinson's theology, then the leaders' ability to absolutely control their subjects becomes severely limited. If, for example, her notions were to be observed in the Colony; the leaders would have great difficulty concretely determining when any abstract code of behavior had truly been observed or disregarded. If free-thinking colonists were to freely claim that their obedience was subjectively dictated by a Christ whom the elders could not see; then such a law that is not objective, black, and white has difficulty of being officially disputed. Potentially, any good or bad thing could become acceptable when an objective measure for law is lacking.

And also very much related to this charge is another one. The elders accuse Hutchinson of believing and discussing another theological heresy. They charge her of teaching that "The Law is no rule of life to a Christian" (*Short Story* 48)<sup>60</sup>. This most likely reflects Hutchinson's literalistic reading of Galatians where Paul speaks of a Christian not being under the law<sup>61</sup>. Indeed, the charge actually words sounds like the

---

<sup>60</sup> Charge number thirteen recorded by Winthrop is Stiles charge number five and six which reads: "5. That we are not bound to the Law, not as a Rule of Life. 6. That being bound to the Law, no transgression of the Law is sinful" (*The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 163).

<sup>61</sup> What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness of his* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth,

Apostle Paul himself. So if, as the Leadership probably fears, Hutchinson might be teaching her devotees to disregard their laws because she literalistically reads Paul to be saying the Colony can rightly do so; then the colony leaders probably fear that Hutchinson's teachings grant leaders even less authority to require the people to obey them. If she is indeed teaching citizens that all are "not ...bound to the Law ..."; if indeed, it is not a transgression against the Law to sin or break it, "because our sins ... are inward and Spiritual, and so are exceeding sinful, and only are against Christ" (*Short Story* 63); then this potentially gives colonists the right to disregard official interpretations of the law which seem wrong to them.

The author believes the Court suspects that behind Hutchinson's theology is her desire to lessen the obligations of citizens to honor the laws. These laws, of course, derive their authority from the official interpretation of the Old Testament Law, and of course, its later expressions in the New Testament. Furthermore, if Biblical/theological law is not a rule, then neither are the civic laws it inspires. According to the Court, Hutchinson's heresy inspires sedition. And in the case of Hutchinson, divergent theological thinking and sedition become analogous. This charge also implies another one.

*The Colony Leaders Fear that Hutchinson is Using a Theology to Encourage Citizens to Think for Themselves.* The Court also accuses Hutchinson of teaching that "There is no evidence to be had of our good estate, either from absolute or conditional promise"<sup>62</sup>.

---

he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord (II Corinthians 4:7-18).

<sup>62</sup> Interestingly, Winthrop's charge number sixteen against Hutchinson almost seems to contradict his charge number twelve which reads: "There is no evidence to be had of our

Most likely, this again references a Calvinistic theology called ‘election and foreknowledge’. According to this theological perspective, persons can hope yet never truly know if they are in fact part of those elected in eternity past for citizenship in heaven or hell. Persons can never have this secure knowledge because there no “absolute or conditional promise” found in the Scriptures (*Short Story* 48). This implies that people cannot know their eternal destiny. It gives them the right to live according to the ways they themselves deem best.

If as Hutchinson reportedly teaches, “that neither absolute nor conditional promises belong to a Christian....” (*Short Story* 48); then her teaching also implies how God has not any communicated any specific courses of action to humans by which they can be rewarded. If the rest of the Colony embraces her teaching, then leadership’s right to punish those insubordinate to the Law becomes even more difficult. If colonists accept Hutchinson’s ideas as true, then they become potentially free to think and live their lives as *they* not their leaders see it. A colonist will have to use his own mind to determine what is good and right. And free thinking citizens also cease to be solely controlled by the dictates of those who govern them.

And perhaps the best example of this kind of free-thinking comes from Hutchinson herself. The elders also take issue with Hutchinson’s discussions about the nature of the resurrection body. They probably fear that she is using her discussion about

---

good estate, either from absolute or conditional promises”. While charge number sixteen reads “The first thing God reveals to assure us is our election.” Charge number sixteen suggests a person can know one’s election. Yet, charge number twelve seems to suggest otherwise. There seems to be an inconsistency here. Again, Stiles record of this charge (his charge number nine) reads: “That the first things we receive for our Assurance is our Election” (*The Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 163).

this theology concerning the human body to make her case for free-thinking. Winthrop records in charges three, four, and five how the court disagrees with Hutchinson's public discussions about the doctrine of the resurrection. The Court charges that Hutchinson heretically believes and teaches her study groups that:

3. Those who are united to Christ, have, in this life, new bodies, and two bodies, 1 Cor. 6. 19. She knows not how Jesus Christ should be united to these our fleshly Bodies.
4. Those who have union with Christ, shall not rise with the same fleshly bodies, 1 Cor. 15. 44.
5. John. 5 28 is not meant of the resurrection of the body, but of our union here and after this life. (*Short Story* 61)

In response to these indictments, Hutchinson interestingly uses what seems to be a method of reading Scripture which John Cotton her teacher also uses<sup>63</sup>. She examines, then collates, and finally synchronizes all of her literalistic readings in support of her theology of the resurrection. Specifically, after she examines I Corinthians 6.19<sup>64</sup>, she collates it with Corinthians 15:44<sup>65</sup>. Then after examining I Corinthians 15:44, she then

---

<sup>63</sup> This has been previously described and illustrated in Chapter Three of this dissertation.

<sup>64</sup> Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. ***What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you*** (italics mine) which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's (I Corinthians 6:18-20).

<sup>65</sup> ***So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory*** (Italics mine)? The sting of death *is* sin; and the strength of sin *is* the law. But thanks *be* to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ (I Corinthians 15:54-56).

collates both of these with John 5:28<sup>66</sup>. Finally, synchronizing the results of her literalistic readings, she uses her results to think creatively and divergently about the resurrection. Her thinking process leads her to envision how the future resurrected bodies of colonists will be quite unlike those of the present; and so she proposes how the experience of the resurrection body is possible in the here and now! Thinking out loud she says “the promise of Believer’s resurrection body [is] one and the same as the present mortal body of Believers”. In the spirit of free inquiry, she even conjectures about the particular ways which the Believer’s present body could be “united to Jesus Christ” (*Short Story* 61).

Perhaps for twenty-first century minds, this synchrony resulting from her collation of Texts might seem peculiar. Yet this odd theology is immensely invaluable for illuminating Hutchinson’s argument, as well as her work as a literalistic Bible reader and free thinker. Here one sees not only her selection and analysis of Bible Texts in literalistic ways, but also her characteristic curiosity. One watches her speculate, and ask questions about how specific Texts might be interpreted singly and together.

Obviously, her answers do not match the official ones of her accusers. In fact, the court disapproves of her insights, and especially her willingness to gain new answers by reading Texts differently than they would read them. They consider her a heretic, as well as someone who uses theology to inspire others to think in ways not helpful for the continuance of the Colony.

---

<sup>66</sup> Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. (John 5:28)

For the Court, Hutchinson and her followers' discussions pose a peril. If presently the bodies of the Colony's Believers are only "fleshly", and hence, sinful; if believers' presently sinful human natures render them incapable of obeying even in a yet perfect future kingdom; then what does this do for the leaders' power to appeal to their followers in the here and now? If it is true that colonists are incapable of following a perfect Law due to their imperfect natures, how can colony leaders require obedience<sup>67</sup>. Once again, for these leaders, the Antinomian Controversy becomes more than just a controversy; indeed, it has the promise of mutating into a feared anarchy<sup>68</sup>.

So to summarize, the author believes that for the Court, Hutchinson's theological statements contain veiled agendas. Hutchinson's Biblical theologies are the presenting yet not the real concerns. On one side of the struggle is the elder's active attempts to maintain power over the Colony. On the other side of this standoff is Hutchinson's heretical and seditious statements which challenges the elder's right to solely rule<sup>69</sup>.

---

<sup>67</sup> This seems to be the belief behind this accusation. Consider charge twenty-eight where Winthrop records how Hutchinson is said to believe: "That so far as a Man is in union with Christ, he can do no duties perfectly, and without the Communion of the unregenerate part with the regenerate" (*Short Story* 62).

<sup>68</sup> With regard to Hutchinson's view of the soul's mortality, Winthrop says, "though she were pressed by many Scriptures and reasons alleged by the elders of the same, and other Churches, so as she could not give any Answer to them, ***yet she stood to her Opinion***, (italics mine). At length a stranger being desired to speak to the point, and he opening to her the difference between the Soul and the Life, the first being a Spiritual substance, and the other the union of that with the body; ***she then confessed she saw more light than before, and so with some difficulty was brought to confess her Error in that point*** [italics mine]". (*Short Story* 64)

<sup>69</sup> Winthrop in his list of charges looks backward and excellently summarizes the accusations and issues of the November 1637 civil trial. His list is also anticipatory, too. It prepares the reader of his transcript for Hutchinson's banishment occurring five months later in March 1638.

And once again, as will be seen now, Hutchinson's continuing insistence on asking questions and thinking with her followers in creative, non-divergent ways about theological/social issues begins the final day of court room inquisitions.

### **The Colony's Banishment of Hutchinson and the Literalistic Use of the Bible**

*The Colony Leaders Believe Hutchinson's Questions are Diabolical and They Read the Bible Literalistically to Prove it.* As day two of Hutchinson's ecclesiastical trial continues on March 22, 1638, Stiles records how Hutchinson is called on that Thursday "a Lecture Day after [the] sermon" to stand before "all the Elders of other Churches & the Face of the Country". According to Stiles, Brother Wilson tells her at this time that she is called "to give an answer for the things which the Boston Church or the Elders of other churches" had charged her. He tells her that this second inquisition will be about "opinions", whether she holds them or not, and perhaps whether she "will revoke them" (*Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 180).

According to Winthrop, on this second day of the ecclesiastical trial Hutchinson acknowledges that she has indeed spoken most of which she stands accused. He records how indeed "a Copy of them had been sent to her divers days before, and the witnesses hands subscribed [to them], so as she saw it was in vain to deny them" (*Short Story* 48). Again, Hutchinson asks the court "By what rule...an Elder could come to her pretending to desire light, and indeed to entrap her". To this the "same Elder" (Thomas Shephard) answers that even though he had visited with her twice; even though he had been troubled over some of her speeches at St. Ives during the court trial; he simply desired "to see light for the ground and meaning" of her views. He then professes once again "in the presence of the Lord, that he came not to entrap her", but "in compassion to help her Soul", and

“to help her out of those *Snares of the Devil* (italics mine), wherein he saw she was entangled” (Winthrop 48).

Here, the elder reads and applies the Bible allegory, the “Snares of the Devil” in figurative ways to Hutchinson. In its Pauline context this phrase the “Snares of the Devil” alludes to the possibility of God granting apostates “repentance” through their “acknowledging... the truth”. Paul’s words speak about those “who are taken captive”, and how in spite of believing heresy they “may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil” (II Timothy 2:26). The words “snares of the devil” refer specifically to heretical questions regarding the body and spirit, those which do nothing but “gender strife” (II Timothy 2:23) among the churches.

Using this allegory, the elder, though, labels Hutchinson’s asking of *all* theological questions of whatever sort, as a diabolical falling into the “snares of the Devil”. In order to condemn Hutchinson’s spirit of free inquiry (Winthrop 63), the elder uses a literalistically read Text of Paul to do so. Hutchinson, however, feels not only justified in creating and sharing her opinions, she also feels she has the right to change them.

*Hutchinson Believes She Has the Right to Express and Change Her Opinions and She Uses Literalistic Readings of the Bible to Prove It.* According to Winthrop, day two of the ecclesiastical trial continues with Hutchinson expressing her extreme disappointment with John Cotton her teacher. She also asks the leaders “for what error she had been banished, professing...that she held none of these things she was now charged with, before her [house] Imprisonment” (*Short Story* 63). Stiles in his version of the events records how the court repeats the charges against Hutchinson. She responds to



them with two answers. First, so very characteristic of a true thinker, Hutchinson proclaims to the Court how after personal reflection she has changed her theological opinions. Secondly, she also denies ever believing certain tenets of which she stands accused.

In response to her theologies, many of which were framed by an explicit or implicit use of literalistic, allegorical or typological readings of Scripture, Hutchinson claims that she has since changed some of her theological perspectives. For example, as regards her view of the resurrection-- those who have union with Christ shall not be resurrected with their present bodies—she says: “I doe acknowledge I was deeply deceived, the opinion was very dangerous” (*Trial of Mrs. Hutchinson* 181).

Responding again to the court about her view of the immortality of the soul, she also says how she “never doubted” that the “soul is immortal”, and that she officially renounces her predestinarian belief. She rejects her former belief that some souls were “purchased” and destined for “eternal pain” while others for eternal joys (Stiles 181).

Answering for her views about the resurrection, also previously described, she acknowledges her “Mistake” of believing that Christians have “two Bodies”. Reading Paul’s words literalistically, she confesses her change of opinion and how that she “now sees that the [words] of the Apostle in 1 Cor: 6. 14. 15 speaks of persons, in one place, & of bodies, in another” (Stiles 181). Again, using another literalistically read Text of Paul to prove her own teachability to the court, she “acknowledges and gives thanks to God” that she “better see[s]” how Christ is “united to our Fleshly Bodies, as [in] 1 Cor. 6. 18. 19”. She now believes, “that the same body that lies in the Grave, shall rise again”. In light of her own literalistic readings of Scripture, she renounces her former opinion as

erroneous. She had formerly maintained that “those who have union with Christ shall not rise in the [same] bodies” (Stiles 180).

She also indicates to the court how she has changed her opinion about the graces belonging to Believers. She says “she desires to be understood” that such graces are not inherent in Believers, but that they “flow from Christ”. She confesses that she does not acknowledge any graces accompanying salvation before this union (Stiles 181), and how before her trial she had believed just the opposite.

She speaks about how she has changed her belief about Christ and His Body, the Church on earth. She voices how she has come to believe that both Christ and His mansion for Believers are to be found in heaven (Stiles 181).

She indicates her change of thinking about the nature of righteousness: “I have considered some Scriptures that satisfy me that the Image of Adam is Righteousness & Holiness.” Formerly, she had said that “an Hypocrite may have Adam’s righteousness & perish” (Stiles 181).

Yet, for the Court, Hutchinson’s most important change of thinking is probably this. She acknowledges and confesses to the court that in fact “the Law is a Rule of Life”. Previously, in the civic trial she had used her literalistic reading of Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians to support her agenda which said Christians, and therefore colonists, were not obligated to live under the Law. So, undoubtedly, for the court this is the moment for which they had been waiting. They hear her say how she has come over to their side of the debate. They hear her specifically say how she “acknowledges the other [opposite view she held] to be a hateful Error, & that which openeth a Gap to all Licentiousness”. For a Court who believes that the observance of their interpretation of the Law is

indispensable to the stability of their colony, this is a welcomed confession, indeed.

Hutchinson now proclaims how she believes the “Law [to be] a Rule of our Life, & if we do any Thing contrary to it it is a grievous Sin” (Stiles 181). She denies “that not being bound to the Law it is no Transgression to break it.” She acknowledges any Breach of the Law is a sin” (Stiles 182).

Clearly seen here is how Hutchinson believes that her literalistic, allegorical, and typological readings of Scripture which support her theologies are not final. Her statements are open-ended, always subject to questions, always subject to change. These ways of reading always allow Hutchinson the right to change her mind. Undoubtedly, through her inspiration many of her followers approach questions about the Bible and its theology in much the same way. They too spend much time questioning what they hear from their preacher.

But even as Hutchinson indicates how her opinions have changed, she also tells the court that they are just wrong for accusing her of believing other doctrines. She denies ever believing that “there is no faith of God’s Elect but Assurance & that there is no Faith of Dependence, but such as Hypocrites may have”. She says, “I never held any such thing” (Stiles 182). This of course meets with the court’s resistance and accusations. Elder Leveret responds, “It seems you did hold it, tho’ after you revoked it” (Stiles 182). Refusing her testimony, Leveret accuses Hutchinson of lying.

She also denies to the court of ever believing other doctrines they also consider false. For one, “I do not believe that a Hypocrite can attain to Adam’s Righteousness” (Stiles 182). She denies believing: “We are dull to act in spiritual Things savingly, but as we are acted by Christ” (Stiles 182).

And as this part of the interrogation concludes, perhaps most important for her own defense, Hutchinson explains how her thinking was once influenced by having “undo regard” for the opinions of leaders. Yet, she also denies ever having been intentionally disrespectful to her ministers:

As my sine hath bine open, so I think it needful to acknowledge how I came first to fall into these Errors. Instead of Looking upon myself I looked at Men, I know my Dissembling will do no good. I spake rashly & unadvisedly. I do not allow the slighting of Ministers, nor of the Scriptures nor any Thing that is set up by God: if Mr Shephard doth conceive that I had any of these Things in my Mind, than he is deceived. It was never in my heart to slight any man, but only that man should be kept in his own place & not set in the Room of God. (Stiles 182)

In spite of this response, and maybe because of it, it makes little difference what Hutchinson believes or now says. Even when she says she believes what the leadership requires her to believe, and even when she renounces her previous views before the court, she is not taken seriously by them. Indeed, at this point in the trial, it seems that her banishment is indeed already decided. This trial was to see if she had changed her opinions since November 1637, but apparently the court refuses to be totally convinced that significant change has occurred during her approximately six month long house arrest. The elders also refuse to believe that her open and questioning nature leads her to sincerely renounce falsehoods when she clearly perceives them. It seems by now that the elders must always be right without ever admitting they can be wrong. Hutchinson, however, has no problems with being wrong and admitting it so she can become right, at least in her own eyes.

So in light of the court being convinced that Hutchinson is a liar, day two of the ecclesiastical trial continues on Thursday, March 22 1638. By the time it concludes, Hutchinson will be banished. The Bible is used again by Cotton literalistically to enforce

Hutchinson's banishment; and Hutchinson employs now her mostly allegorical and typological readings in the final struggle to resist her banishment.

*In Order to Support Their Decision to Banish Hutchinson, Cotton and Others of the Court Read the Bible Both Literalistically and Allegorically.* Refusing to believe Hutchinson's own claim that there are no differences between her and John Cotton's teaching (Stiles 186); the elders adamantly refuse to be satisfied with her ideas. They disregard her previous confessions. They do not believe that her house arrest saw the beginnings of the cause of all her errors, "as if she were innocent before" (Stiles 187). According to the Court, Hutchinson has been behaving this way for a very long time. In Brother Wilson's opinion, before she came to Boston there was "much love and union and sweet agreement amongst us." Now "all love and union hath bine broken," Yes, it is the "Misgovernment of this Woman" which has "been a great Cawse of this disorder" (Stiles 188). She has now become the Colony's scapegoat.

Now with all the incriminating evidence against Hutchinson having been fully heard, the Court reaches a decision.

This woman must go!

Mr. Shephard and Mr. Mathers justifies the Court's decision to banish by again reading the Bible literalistically. Guided by his reading of a Pauline instruction about heretics found in the Epistle to Titus, Shephard states how Hutchinson has already been publicly corrected. According the way he reads the rule found in Paul's Epistle, Hutchinson has no need of any further Biblical reprimands.

I perceive it is the Desire of many of the Brethren to stay her Excommunication, & to let a ***second Admonition*** [italics mine]<sup>70</sup> lie upon her; but now for one not to drop a Lie, but to make a Lie<sup>71</sup>, & to maintain a Lie: & to do it in a day of Humiliation, & in the sight of God, & such a Congregation as this is, I would have this Church consider, whether it will be for the Honor of God & the honor of this Church to bare with patience so gross an offender. (*Trial of Mrs. Hutchinson* 190)

Mr. Mather agreeing with Shephard, figuratively reads the term “gangrene” as referred to by Paul in II Timothy 2:14-19. Likening Hutchinson’s heretical free-thinking and discussions with others as “gangrene”, Mather adds that if she were allowed to remain her doctrinal malady would spread, not just infecting the groups meeting in her home, but the entire Colony. Reading Paul’s Epistle literalistically Mather justifies his decision to send Hutchinson away so that her thinking will no longer lead to any further problems in the Colony.

The Apostle saith an Heretic after once or twice Admonition reject & cut of like a ***Gangrene*** [Italics mine] as the word signifies<sup>72</sup>: now, she hath been once

---

<sup>70</sup> But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. ***A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject*** [italics mine]; Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself. (Titus 3:9-10)

<sup>71</sup> And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed *are* they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without *are* dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, ***and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie*** [Italics mine]. (Revelation 22: 10-15)

<sup>72</sup> Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane *and* vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. ***And their word will eat as doth a canker*** [italics mine]: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the

admonished already, why than should not the Church proceed. (*Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson* 190)

In addition to Shephard and Mather's literalistic uses of the Bible, John Cotton also justifies his arguments favoring the banishment of his devoted student Hutchinson by making literalistic uses of an apocalyptic Text. Although he expresses how one time he was reluctant to excommunicate her, now he "according to the duty of his place being the Teacher of that Church" is willing to vote for it. (*Short Story* 60). Literalistically reading Revelation 21:27, he offers his rationale for Hutchinson's banishment which says that "such as make and maintain a lie, ought to be cast out of the Church"<sup>73</sup> (*Short Story* 60). Out of the language of Revelation 22 which speaks of the eternally unrepentant and their refusal to recognize their entire life's misdeeds, Cotton creates a rule about liars to justify expelling an accused liar from the Colony.

And in spite of two or three objectors in the church requesting that Hutchinson be granted a "second admonition", Winthrop remains resolute. He even responds with a rule he has created from another literalistic reading of Paul's instruction about "the second

---

resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. (II Timothy 2:14-19)

<sup>73</sup> And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb *is* the light thereof. **24**And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. ***And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie:*** [italics mine] but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life. (Revelation 21:27)

admonition” (Titus 3:9-11)<sup>74</sup> He responds to the challengers by saying “the second admonition” applies only “for such as [have] erred in point of Doctrine”. “Those such as shall notoriously offend in matter of Conversation,”-- and Hutchinson this means you!-- “ought to be presently cast out” (*Short Story* 60).

Cotton, continuing to use his interpretive principles of examination, collation, and synchrony, continues his appeal for the banishment of Hutchinson. He adds to Revelation 21:27 his collation of Texts another literalistic examination. This time it is the Lukan narrative of Acts (5:1-9), with its story of Ananias and the Sapphira (*Short Story* 60) He cites and examines a Text which describes the story of a Divine judgment which fell upon two Jerusalem church goers. According to the Story, both believed they could lie to God about their feigned generosity to the Church. In response to Peter’s pronouncement of judgment upon them for this, Ananias was struck dead for lying, then Sapphira. As a result, Luke concludes the story with how “great fear came upon all the church, and upon as many as heard these things” (Acts 5:9).

Justifying his vote to rid the Colony of a proven liar, and to sanctify his wished for her to be judged, Cotton literalistically reads this Narrative, not just as her teacher but her judge. For Cotton, Hutchinson’s story is exactly like that of the liars Ananias and Sapphira. Hutchinson, according to Cotton, is someone who is ripe for the judgment of God. She is lying about her professed change of theological/social views. She knows it. Her judges know it. Cotton, just like others of the court, refuse to believe the sincerity of

---

<sup>74</sup> But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. ***A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject*** [italics mine]; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself. (Titus 3:9-11)



her recantations. Just like the Church mentioned in the Book of Acts, Hutchinson's followers also need to take heed and fear, lest judgment fall on them, too!

Then, to further support his view that lying about one's changed theological beliefs is unforgivable, Cotton collates his literalistic reading of Acts 5:1-9 with another agenda driven, literalistic reading of a Text found in Paul's First Epistle of Corinthians 5:1-5<sup>75</sup>. It seems like such a strange choice since Paul in this verse and context is instructing how the church should discipline a case of incest occurring among some of its members. Regardless, Cotton reads and uses for his banishment purposes Paul's words about a rule and practice of the Corinthian Church who gathered together to call judgment down upon its offending members. Likening Hutchinson's offense of insincerely indicating her change of opinions as something unforgivable, he claims for this she must be banished.

And since he believes it must happen immediately, he again reads literalistically and sees the present as the only time to act. Equating his decision as one sanctioned indeed by Paul's instructions for the Church at Corinth, Cotton decides that "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when [the church is] gathered together... with the power of our

---

<sup>75</sup> It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed,<sup>4</sup> In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, *To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus* [italics mine] (I Corinthians 5:1-5).

Lord Jesus Christ”, Hutchinson must be delivered “unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that [her] spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (I Corinthians 5:3-7).

And just in case the collated literalistic evidences of Titus 3:10 and I Corinthians 5:3-7 do not provide enough Textual based reasons for convincing the Colony that Hutchinson must depart, Cotton collates one more Text into his mix of evidences and rhetorical appeals. Hoping to prove beyond question that Hutchinson his student is a liar worthy of judgment, Cotton literalistically reads the story of Simon Magus appearing in the Lukan Narrative of Acts 8:18-23. In this narrative, Simon Magus is presented as a sorcerer living in ancient Samaria. He is described as someone who “bewitch[e]s the people”, and as a person to whom all the Samaritans “gives heed ... from the least to the greatest, saying, ‘This man is the great power of God’” (Acts 8:9). Simon Magus admires Peter’s demonstrations of power associated with the impartation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit to Believers. He even submits to water baptism in an effort to identify with the Christians, but assuming Peter’s gift as just another magical power, Simon Magus attempts to purchase it. Peter refuses, pronounces judgments, and Simon Magus requests that none of them would happen.

Cotton examines this Text from Acts, and collating them with his two other Bible passages, he uses it figuratively to paint for the congregation that Hutchinson is a modern hypocritical deceiver like Simon Magus. Although it cannot be solidly proven, Cotton may be thinking here about how this story has several parallels between Simon Magus and Hutchinson. Both personages have great followings, and just like Simon Magus in the Book of the Acts, all within the Boston Colony “have given heed...” to Hutchinson “from the least to the greatest”(Acts 8:10). In Cotton’s not so veiled and probable

estimation, many people in the Colony think much too highly of her. She like Simon Magus, is regarded as “the great power of God” (Acts 8:10). And like Simon Magus, Hutchinson’s profession of faith is false, even though she exudes and exerts a powerful influence over the people.

Cotton also probably sees how Hutchinson is like Simon Magus in another important way. When it comes to living in the Colony, Cotton through his literalistic reading of the story believes she like Simon Magus, has no “part nor lot in this matter; for her heart like his “is not right in the sight of God” (Acts 8:21). After all, as Cotton and the Court maintain, Hutchinson during the past six months of her trials and house arrest has had more than sufficient opportunity to repent, but she has refused to do so. And when she has acknowledged, recanted, or clarified her views, it has been too little and too late.

She has simply lied about her changed perspectives, and like Simon Magus of old has not “repent[ed] of [her] wickedness” (Acts 8:22). Like Simon Magus, she needs to pray to “God, if perhaps the thoughts of her [mind and heart] may be forgiven her” (Acts 8:22). She is a woman of fiery and outspoken carriage, and like Simon Magus, she is residing in the “gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity” (Acts 8:23).

Banishment, then, is the only answer for the problem called Hutchinson.

Finally, in light of all his examined and collated Texts which Cotton uses to validate and illustrate his reasons for Hutchinson’s banishment, Cotton summarizes their implications. That is, he uses synchrony. He makes a rhetorical appeal to require the congregation and court to endorse Hutchinson’s banishment.

Winthrop then records how Cotton's point was "proved" (*Short Story* 60); and how he "the Pastor went on, propounding it to the Church, to know whether they were all agreed, that she should be cast out". Soon, as Winthrop records, a full consent appeared (after the usual manner)". All present showed their consent by their silence" (*Short Story* 64).

According to Winthrop, Hutchinson "for her own part...heard this moved in her behalf", and even though "she might have [had] a further respite, yet she herself never desired it" (*Short story*). And so after a "convenient pause", Hutchinson's Pastor proceeds. Cotton asks Pastor Wilson to deliver the sentence, and he "denounced the Sentence of Excommunication against her" (*Short Story* 60). Not surprising this denouncement, most fully recorded by Stiles in his version of the transcript, is replete with literalistic readings of Bible texts, or clear allusions to them. In the presence of the entire Court/Congregation Pastor Wilson reads:

Forasmuch as yow, M. Hutchison, have highly transgressed & of fended, & forasmuch as yow have so many ways troubled the Church with your Errors & have drawn away many a poor soul, & have upheld yor Revelations: & forasmuch as yow have made a Lye, &c. Therefore in the name of our Lord Je: Ch: & in the name of the Church I doe not only pronounce yow worthy to be cast out, but I do cast yow out & in the name of Ch. I doe ***deliver you up to Sathan, that you may learn no more to blaspheme***<sup>76</sup>(italics mine), to seduce & to lye, & ***I do account you from this time forth to be a Heathen & a Publican***<sup>77</sup> (italics mine), & so to

---

<sup>76</sup> I Corinthians 5:5

<sup>77</sup> Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee*, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask,

be held of all the Brethren & Sisters, of this Congregation, & of others : therfo1" I command yow in the name of Ch: Je: & of this Church ***as a Leper to withdraw your self out of the Congregation***<sup>78</sup> ; that as formerly yow have despised & contemned the Holy Ordinances of God, & turned your Back on them, so you may now have no part in them nor benefit by them. (Stiles)

With these final words, Hutchinson is commanded to leave the Colony. And so she does. Winthrop records:

and she was commanded to depart out of the Assembly. In her going forth, one standing at the door, said, The Lord sanctify this unto you, to whom she made answer, The Lord judgeth not as man judgeth<sup>79</sup>, better to be cast out of the Church than to deny Christ. (*Short Story* 60)

She leaves the church to find a future as a banished woman with dependent children, but not without offering a resistant and final response. But really? Was this word her final word in all of this?

*To Justify the Riddance of a Free-Thinker, Winthrop Reads the Bible*

*Literalistically and Allegorically.* Sometime after the conclusion of the second day of the ecclesiastical trial of March 22, 1638, Winthrop reflects about the entire Hutchinson matter. One might think his literalistic, allegorical, and typological readings of the Bible would have long concluded. But not so. Even though Hutchinson is officially banished from the Colony, and is now teaching again in Rhode Island; Winthrop continues in his

---

it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. (Matthew 18:15-20)

<sup>78</sup> Numbers 5:1-4 speaks of how lepers are to be isolated from the congregation.

<sup>79</sup> Perhaps Hutchinson has in mind the words of (I Samuel 16:6-10): "So it was, when they came, that he looked at Eliab and said, "Surely the LORD's anointed *is* before Him!" But the LORD said to Samuel, "Do not look at his appearance or at his physical stature, because I have refused him. ***For the LORD does not see as man sees; for man looks at the outward appearance, but the LORD looks at the heart*** [italics mine]."

literalistic and allegorical readings of the Bible. He does so to continue justifying the improvements Hutchinson's banishment is accomplishing

For example, looking back on the ordeal, Winthrop in his *Short Story* wishes to once again justify the Colony's decision to banish Hutchinson from the Colony. Citing an allegory from the Apocalypse, Winthrop likens her to a "woman...mentioned in Revelation" (*Short Story* 64).

Thus it hath pleased the Lord to have compassion on his poor Churches here, and to discover, this great Impostor, an instrument of Satan so fitted and trained to his Service for interrupting the passage of his Kingdom in this part of the world, and poisoning the Churches here planted, as no story records the like of a woman, since that mentioned in the Revelation; it would make a large volume to lay down all passages, I will only observe some few, which were obvious to all that know her course. (*Short Story* 64)

Concluding his transcript of Hutchinson's trial, he offers his opinion about the entire saga, and his own allegorical readings which designate Hutchinson as a "Jezebel".

Here is to be seen the presence of God in his Ordinances, when they are faithfully attended according to his holy Will, although not free from human Infirmities: This *American Jezebel* (italics mine) kept her strength and reputation, even among the people of God, till the hand of Civil Justice laid hold on her, and then she began evidently to decline, and the Faithful to be freed from her Forgeries; and now in this last act, when she might have expected (as most likely she did) by her seeming repentance of her Errors, and confessing her undervaluing of the Ordinances of Magistracy and Ministry, to have redeemed her reputation in point of sincerity, and yet have made good all her former work, and kept open a back door to have returned to her vomit again, by her paraphrastical retractions, and denying any change in her judgment, yet such was the presence and blessing of God in his own Ordinance, that this Subtlety of Satan was many godly hearts, that had been captivated by her to that day; and that Church which by her means was brought under much Infamy, and near to dissolution, was hereby sweetly repaired, and a hopeful way of Establishment, and her dissembled Repentance clear detected, *God giving her up* (italics mine) since the Sentence of Excommunication, to that hardness of heart, as she is not affected with any Remorse, but glories in it, and fears not the Vengeance of God, which she lies

under, as if God did work contrary to his own word, *and loosed from Heaven what his Church had bound upon earth* (Italics mine)<sup>80</sup>(*Short Story* 60).

Winthrop's transcript of Hutchinson's trial not only begins with Bible references mentioned in his title page (Ephesians 4:14; II Peter 3.17), it ends with one, too--a passage from Matthew 18:18: "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" Winthrop literalistically and with finality reads this Text as a justification for a Community renouncing its own.

### Chapter Summary

During the ecclesiastical trial, Hutchinson is banished because she is charged with heresy/sedition resulting from her willingness to think and ask questions with others. It has been shown that the Colony fears that her theology resulting from her readings of the Bible will either prevent citizens from attempting to do what the elders consider as right and good; or, that her beliefs will encourage a powerful and growing collective voice of the people; or perhaps cause the loss of an objective standard of right and wrong; or, allow the people to think for themselves.

Furthermore, when it comes to Hutchinson's banishment, the Colony leaders believe Hutchinson's questions are diabolical, and they read the Bible literalistically to prove it. And in this regard Hutchinson believes she has the right to express and change her opinions so she uses her literalistic readings of the Bible to substantiate her claims.

---

<sup>80</sup> Matthew 18:18

Finally, in order to support their decision to banish Hutchinson, Cotton and others of the court read the Bible in ways to support their choice to do so. And to further justify the recent riddance of a free-thinker, Winthrop reads the Bible both literalistically and allegorically to accomplish this.



## **CHAPTER V**

### **EPILOGUE, OR LESSONS LEARNED FROM LITERALISTIC, ALLEGORICAL, AND TYPOLOGICAL READINGS OF MEANINGS FOUND IN THE COLONY'S PROTESTANT BIBLE, AS WELL AS THEIR ACCOMPANYING RHETORICAL USES APPEARING IN THE TRANSCRIPTS OF ANNE HUTCHINSON'S CIVIL (NOVEMBER 1637) AND ECCLESIASTICAL TRIAL (MARCH 1638)**

#### **Introduction**

As promised earlier, this final chapter will conclude the rhetorical analysis of Hutchinson's trial transcripts by describing some more modern implications of Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson's interpretative and rhetorical uses of the Colony's Bible. Offering a perspective about their characteristically Puritan uses of the Bible, the author will briefly allude to how their approaches are not anomalous.

Indeed, their kind of interpretive and rhetorical moves are those of other seventeenth century American Puritan thinkers, too. Typically in many of these American Puritan uses of Scripture, agendas motivate and fuel the interpretative process. They help to justify foregone conclusions or planned actions just like Winthrop and Cotton who in the transcripts of Hutchinson's trial read to support their predetermined authoritarian agendas. As has already been seen, Winthrop and Cotton's ways of reading are very like Hutchinson's who reads in the same ways, but with a different purpose. While they read to support their authoritarian agendas, she reads the Bible in order to support her liberatory ends.

So after a brief word about the similarities of their patterns of readings with other seventeenth century New England Bible readers, the author will illustrate how similar styles of literalistic Bible reading appear also in key moments of American history, both past and recent. In light of all these uses-- some good and some bad-- she will then conclude by proposing what seems to be more productive ways of reading the Bible for our times.

### **Perspectives From the Past**

As just mentioned, Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson's approaches to reading the Bible as already demonstrated in Chapter III and Chapter IV were not anomalous. Their typical interpretive and persuasive moves were also used by other American Puritan thinkers of their day.

Many Puritans of seventeenth century New England connected the Bible and rhetoric in special ways. As Perry Miller, in his work *The New England Mind in the Seventeenth Century*, shows while Puritans typically avoided "wresting" a Text from its context to support conclusions which a Bible verse might not support (20). He shows how the roles of reason and dialectic played big parts, too. He demonstrates their notion that "whatsoever is drawn out of the Scripture by consequence and deduction" is also considered the Word of God. According to Miller, the Puritans of seventeenth century New England regarded these deductions just as valid as an "express commandment or example in Scripture" (Miller 20). So then, while Puritans drew a line between revelation and reason, it was a very thin and faint one. Because Puritans viewed faith and reason symbiotically, New England Puritan readers typically sought to prove the Bible, and read it "by deductions according to reason's law articulated in dialectic" (Miller 202).

Miller also offers how these Puritans looked upon “discoverable truth as already discovered”, that truth was “set down in black and white, once and for all, by the supreme wisdom”. For them “nothing could be learned outside revelation”. This was because:

Puritan thought was incurably authoritarian and legalistic. Every proposition had to be bolstered by chapter and verse, and the margins of books, whether of divinity or politics, science or morals, the margins even of love-letters had to be studded with citations. (*The New England Mind* 21)

So by using this sense of applied reason and dialectic many American Puritans read Scripture. Their reasoning, or their agendas, allowed them to dictate the ways they read and invoked their discovered truths. Their agendas so energized their readings that they believed the Bible could justify any foregone conclusion or action they desired.

These ways of Puritan reading and persuasion seemed also to abound in both their first and second generations. So whether it be a minister like Thomas Shepard (1605-1649) who in his 1648 *Defense of the Answer* defends a congregational not Presbyterian form of government in the Colony by citing his reading of Micah 7:18<sup>81</sup> (Miller 27); or, be it Thomas Hooker (1586-1647) who in his *True Sight of Sin* reads John 6:38 to communicate the sublimity of those who keep the law and misery upon those who break it<sup>82</sup>; it is very apparent that Puritans other than Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson used their agendas to read the Bible in order to persuade others. Other examples include

---

<sup>81</sup> “Who *is* a God like unto thee that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth *in* mercy. He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.” (Micah 7:18)

<sup>82</sup> “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” (John 6:38)

minister Nathaniel Ward (1578-1652) who in his 1647 *Simple Cobbler of Aggawam* reads John 8: 32<sup>83</sup> to support his agenda for the Colony to believe that their understanding of “truth is the parent of all liberty, whether political or personal” (Miller 101); or, perhaps Peter Bulkley (1583-1659) who in his 1651 homily *For England and New England in The Lesson of the Covenant* reads Luke 1:78<sup>84</sup> to motivate colonists to vigorously and humbly engage in their spiritual work in their new land. It is apparent from just these few selected examples of many that reading the Bible with an agenda was a common practice.

In this general way then, Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson’s styles of reading did not significantly differ from other readers<sup>85</sup>. Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson read in the same ways to in order to accomplish their rhetorical purposes. As already amply demonstrated in Chapter III and Chapter IV, in the trial transcripts Winthrop and Cotton can be seen reading the Bible with the goal of establishing their authoritarian agenda. In those chapters it has been demonstrated that both used the Bible to 1.) to validate and preserve the reputations of its rulers; 2.) to support their ‘rules’ for the Colony; 3.) to

---

<sup>83</sup> And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. (John 8:32)

<sup>84</sup> And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

<sup>85</sup> Other examples of these agenda driven Bible readings can also be seen in the 1650 history *Wonder-Working Providence of Sion’s Savior* by Edward Johnson (1598-1672); the 1667 election sermon *Nehemiah on the Wall* by Jonathan Miller (1624-1668); the book *Vindication of the Government of New England Churches* by John Wise (1652-1725); a 1677 Cambridge speech *The Sovereign Efficacy of Divine Providence* by Urian Oakes (1631-1681); or, a 1697 theological exposition of prophecy entitled *Phaenomena* by Samuel Sewall (1652-1730). See Perry Miller’s *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry*.

justify their means of entrapping the accused; 4). to prove that free-thinking is tantamount to sedition; 5.) to prove that women, Hutchinson particularly, should be subjugated to their husbands, or, 6.) to support the idea that she as free-thinking person should be both excommunicated and banished from their fellowship.

As mentioned earlier in Chapter I, Hutchinson in her struggle with Cotton and Winthrop's authoritarian agendas also read Scripture in the same ways. Yet her motivation and results were different. In responses to their authoritarian visions for the Colony, she wished to accomplish her more liberatory purposes through the ways she read Scripture. As also previously seen in the transcripts, she read the Text with the goals of 1.) supporting her own ideas about free-thinking; 2.) validating her own prophetic teaching ministry; 3.) winning the right to have different opinions from those of the Colony, and being able to change them; 3.) supporting her views about false ministers in the Colony; or 5.) vocalizing her conviction that the Colony deserved God's judgment.

And as seen in Chapter I, when Cotton, Winthrop, and Hutchinson's ways of reading are generally compared and contrasted, one sees how 1.) these three read or even re-write its words to make a rhetorical point, however noble or ignoble. Winthrop and Cotton 2.) read a Bible text literalistically when they wish to establish or enforce a rule upon the Colony, and especially Hutchinson. Hutchinson, however, reads the same Bible in a literalistic way in order to resist obeying their rules which they establish and support through their readings. The Bible, then, is 3.) most often read by both Hutchinson and Cotton according to a three-fold method, or 4.) in ways to represent divine sanction for a given action, or 5.) in Winthrop and Cotton's case to hide an agenda. While Cotton and Winthrop 6.) appropriate the salvation history story of Israel for the Colony by reading

typologically; Hutchinson reads similarly and typologically for the purposes of convincing Winthrop and Cotton of her individual destiny to and within the Colony. Allegorical readings are also used in the rhetoric of all three, especially when 7.) the atmosphere becomes more argumentative. Allegories directly or indirectly from the Bible become the way each side calls the other names. And so this is how by reading in similar ways, Cotton and Winthrop and Hutchinson could rhetorically achieve such different outcomes.

*A Literalistically Read Bible: One Method Yields Different Outcomes.* Perhaps with respect to this Antinomian tug of war between Winthrop, Cotton, and Hutchinson (November 1637-March 1638), one might ask, ‘Who won?’ Seemingly, life continued. The power struggles, inspired in part by the agendas used to read the Bible, led to the continuance of the Colony or religious liberty elsewhere. The struggles planted and nurtured seeds for the growing separation of Church and State. Clearly, adherents on both sides of the Antinomian Controversy found places to be and things to do. The Massachusetts Bay Colony, chartered By King Charles I in 1628/29, continued for at least fifty-five more years until its charter was revoked by England in 1684. And after Hutchinson’s departure, Winthrop and Cotton continued to lead their Colony for a time. Anne Hutchison relocated and continued her teaching ministry in Providence, Rhode Island, a colony recently founded by Roger Williams.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> *This Colony was founded by Roger Williams’ who was forced to leave the Bay Colony in 1636.*

Certainly, both sides in this specific moment of the Antinomian Controversy would probably consider themselves the winners. Both groups continued maintaining their stalwart positions and identities.

Probably the most productive question is not ‘Who won?’, but rather ‘What won?’ And the author’s answer to this more helpful question is this: ‘The struggle won’. The agendas of all three were carried out with a Bible that served as both battlefield and weapon. Yet, it was not the first time, nor the last time that such a struggle would ensue. The even more important question for similar Bible and rhetoric struggles of our times might not be the questions ‘Who won?’ or ‘What won?’ Perhaps the better question to ask might be ‘Where to?’ After a brief survey of a few select and related scenarios, this chapter will end by suggesting how an interdisciplinary approach to Early and later American texts seems to be the way to analyze and gain insights into how the Bible often becomes a battlefield and a weapon.

### **Problems in the Past and Present**

To fight or not fight? To enslave humans, or to free them? To exploit the earth, or to protect it? To allow female voices in ministry, or to silence them? To unconditionally submit to one’s pastors, or deacons? Or, to resist them? The rhetorical use of the Bible to convince people to behave in certain ways is not just a phenomenon common to the antinomian struggles in the Boston Bay Colony. Long after Hutchinson and the Colony’s use of the Bible had ceased, persons continued reading the Bible literalistically in order to justify their decisions about a range of issues which include war, prejudice, global warming, authority, and gender issues. Although the list is infinite, the author has chosen for comment only a few significant historic or current issues related in often very

tangential ways to the readings and agendas already seen in this study. These select examples illustrate how agenda driven readings of the Bible continue to appear in both history past and present.

*To Fight or Not to Fight? Examples of the Bible's Literalistic Use from The American Revolution.* Not long after Hutchinson's resistance came the era of the Revolutionary War. James Byrd in his book *Sacred Scripture Sacred War* shows how in the 18<sup>th</sup> century readings from the Bible were used to excite and support agendas summoning Colonists to do God's will and go to war with England. In the world of the American Revolution, Byrd shows:

The clergy translated the Revolution's meaning to most people, and they were successful in doing so largely because they spoke in the all-persuasive stories and images from scripture. In the Biblically saturated American colonies, ministers were the agreed upon experts on the Bible; their sermons were the most serious engagements between scriptura and war in America, both before and during the Revolution. (Sacred Scripture 3)

Byrd also describes how many patriots saw their story reflected in the Exodus. Patriots often compared themselves to the Israelites, God's Chosen people, who were enslaved by the Egyptians much as the colonists were oppressed by the British" (*Sacred Scripture* 45). Many viewed George Washington as "America's Moses" (*Sacred Scripture* 70), or cited the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), or Jeremiah's curse, "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood" (Jeremiah 48:10) as justification for calling soldiers to do battle for the American cause. The Revolutionaries also found their inspiration from the pulpit's citation of David the Warrior who extolled in Psalm 144:2 "God teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight" (*Sacred Scripture*, 94). They also sought and saw justification for their liberty by rebelling against England's rule and



quoted, “Stand in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free” (Galatians 5:1) (*Sacred Scripture* 117); or, they found comfort in patriotic martyrdoms seen in Revelation 2 (*Sacred Scripture* 147). Ministers often voiced their political agendas by connecting them with a supposed Divine sanction excerpted from the pages of a Bible they read literalistically.

David Barton in his blog, “Was the American Revolution a Biblically Justified Act?” writes how:

Presbyterians, Lutherans, Baptists, Congregationalists, and most other Christian denominations during the American Revolution all believed that Romans 13 meant they were not to overthrow the government as an institution and live in anarchy, but that this passage did not mean they had to submit to every civil law (Wallbuilders.com)

According to Barton, with regard to the American Revolution, the Bible was read in to incite the oppressed to fight against Britain defensively not offensively, and in the spirit of civil disobedience. Similar to what might be deemed as a civil disobedience by Hutchinson, many Preachers and communicators used a literalistically read Bible to authorize a nation’s actions of self-defense in response to an aggressor. Yet later the Bible would be read literalistically in both good and bad ways to support slavery or to seek to abolish it.

*To Enslave Humans, or To Free Them? Examples of the Bible’s Literalistic Use During the Civil War Period.* Henry Britton in his excellent article “In Civil War, the Bible Became a Weapon” writes of how Bible passages were often used to justify slavery. *In the* 1860s, says he, “Southern preachers defending slavery also took the Bible literally.” They also used Ephesians 6:5 to sanction their claims that slaves should submit to their masters: “slaves, obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling” (Ephesians

6:5); or, literalistically read Titus 2:9 with their agenda to enslave: "Tell slaves to be submissive to their masters and to give satisfaction in every respect." ” (“In Civil War”).

According to Brinton,

the preachers of the North had to be more creative, but they, too, argued God was on their side. Some emphasized that the Union had to be preserved so that the advance of liberty around the world would not be slowed or even stopped. (*In Civil War*)

Referencing the work of historian James Howell Moorhead of Princeton

Theological Seminary, Brinton describes how preachers of the North also used the Book of Revelation to support a Northern victory which they believed would usher in the Kingdom of God on earth. Still others used the Bible to support abolition with the idea that God would not allow the North to win until slavery ended (*In Civil War*).

And it was not only the white preachers of the North and South who resisted the agendas fueling the literalistic readings of the Bible which supported slavery; Brinton, referencing the historical work of Peter Wood of Duke University, indicates how:

devout black believers — and numerous white abolitionist allies, violent and non-violent — were quick to see slavery as a sin and a defilement of New Testament values that had to be rooted out. (*In Civil War*).

To enslave? Or to free? Obviously, by literalistically reading the Bible with an agenda in mind, each side successfully argued their point. Similar to Winthrop and Cotton who used the Bible to subjugate Hutchinson and to silence her for their purposes; or perhaps like Hutchinson who read the Bible with the goal of freeing people from the tyranny of mind control; slave owners and traders or abolitionists also read the Bible literalistically to support their own authoritarian or liberatory agendas.

And of course, it seems that a Puritan mindset which affirmed the Bible as a reference book for all things in life seems even yet be in vogue. Such a view can be seen in the way the Bible is authoritatively read by some with respect to the modern sciences, particularly the way the Bible is read with regard to ecological issues and global warming.

*To Exploit the Earth? Or, to Protect it: Examples of the Bible's Literalistic Use from Our Modern Times.* Of course, one of the debated issues today is that of global warming. The Bible is often used by some as the judge of science. According to the website *Answers in Genesis*, Rod Martin in his paper "A Proposed Bible-Science Perspective on Global Warming" states how during the last 20 years the media has been covering this issue. He mentions how "major proponents [of global warming] include the United Nations, politicians, environmentalists, and celebrities", and states his belief that "the church has had little to say on the issue" and "has made scant use of Scripture to evaluate the alleged problem". In his academic paper, he proceeds to propose a "biblical (young-earth creationist) framework for evaluating the issue". He reads the Bible attempting to provide answers from the Bible to help Christians to evaluate the scientific community's claims of global warming. He reads the Bible literalistically so that readers can see how his claims of the presence of global warming "is in accord with real science" ("A Proposed Bible-Science Perspective").

Inserting this agenda into his readings of the Bible, Martin argues that "man's activities are not causing global warming." In fact, he says that as "described in the media and by its advocates," this is a myth." He believes that "there is no reason either biblically or scientifically to fear the exaggerated and misguided claims of catastrophe as

a result of increasing levels of man-made carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) (“A Proposed Bible-Science Perspective”). He responds to pro-global warming arguments by reading the Bible literalistically and inserting his ant-global warming arguments into the Texts.

His readings therefore, look like these:

God is in absolute control of His creation. He is the Creator (Genesis 1 and 2). God destroyed His creation in the days of Noah with a worldwide flood (Genesis 7–9). God sets the boundary for the seas (*Job 38:8–11, Psalm 104:9, Jeremiah 5:22*) and controls the weather: lightning (*Job 28:26, 37:3*), hail (*Job 38:22, Psalm 147:17, Haggai 2:17*), rain (*Job 28:26, 37:6, Psalm 147:8*), and snow (*Job 37:6, 38:22, Psalm 147:16*). Someday God will destroy this earth and establish a new heaven and a new earth (*Revelation 21:1*). ***Man is not in control of the weather and this present earth is temporary*** [italics mine]. (“A Proposed Bible-Science Perspective”)

Martin, therefore, reads the Bible literalistically in order to deny that global warming exists. Yet there are some who read the Bible literalistically but with a different motivation.

Henry Binton, for example, thinks that Christians should be concerned and respond constructively to the threat of global warming. Responding with a literalistic reading to a view like Martin’s, he says that even though “with regard to the environment, we no longer live in a biblical world in which humans needed to subdue the earth”, still a Christian response should be modeled after Genesis 2:15. For Martin, Christians should focus on “being good caretakers of the earth, just as Adam was instructed to be when God put him in the garden of Eden ‘to till it and keep it’ (Genesis 2:15).

Unlike Martin’s reading of Scripture, Binton’s reading says that “instead of threatening the health of our planet with our destructive patterns of consumption”, the time for Christians has come “to reclaim the biblical value of stewardship” (“In Civil War

the Bible Became a Weapon”). Once again, as seen here, the method of literalistic reading the Bible yields two distinct categories of answers. And so to this list of war, slavery, and global warming, can also be added a gender issue: specifically, the voices of women in the Church. Of course, as already seen, this was a key issue in the trials of Anne Hutchinson.

*To Allow Female Voices in Ministry? Or, to Silence Them? Examples of the Bible’s Literalistic Use from Our Modern Times.* Certainly in North America today there are those for whom these questions seem so irrelevant. Hearing and heeding the voices of women is not an issue for these churches and para-church organizations. Many energetically celebrate female leaders and endorse them to serve in leadership roles as senior pastors, and members of the pastoral staff.

Yet in some church settings, like the kind referenced in Matt Costella’s article, “Does God’s Word Allow a Woman to Serve as a Pastor in the Church: A Study in the Pastoral Epistles”; a woman is only allowed to enjoy a very limited influence in the Church. In literalistic and rhetorical moves very similar to John Cotton’s examination, collation and synchronizing regarding this same issue, Costella states his agenda. He says that “women are to teach other women and not men in the church”. He, like Cotton, offers his convincing evidence for this agenda by literalistically reading the passages of Titus 1:5; 2:1; 2:3; and 2:5. He interprets the words of I Timothy 2:1-15 to prove that “women are to adorn themselves with good works” which somehow according to his reading excludes them from teaching, preaching, and leading men. Through his literalistic Bible interpretations and applications, he limits women to “showing hospitality,

encouraging others, and keeping believers up-to-date in all the “ministries of the church and the church’s missionaries” (“Does God’s Word Allow”).

Costella even literalistically reads another Epistle of Paul to support his view that “women are to be active learners” when taught by the men. And in words so very reminiscent of Hutchinson’s trial, he uses his agenda to literalistically read and invoke First Timothy 2:11—“let the woman learn in silence with all subjection”. In this respect, he explains:

It is important to note that this statement does not imply that the woman is to completely keep silent within the entire public worship service of the local church. Rather, the woman is to keep silent only in the process of learning, that is, when the male leader of the church is authoritatively teaching the doctrine found in the Word of God. (“Does God’s Word Allow”)

Of course, there are other many other conservative scholars whose readings would disagree with his<sup>87</sup>. One of these conservative theologians is Greg Boyd. In his article “The Case for Women in Ministry”, Boyd reads the Bible literalistically. Yet he reads in order to liberate as opposed to subjugating women. He does not read as Costella whose literalistic reading of I Timothy 2:12 forbids women “to teach or have authority over the man”. In response to a literalistic reading like Costella’s, Boyd cites other Texts which have often been read literalistically to support an agenda of for freedom. According to Boyd,

The Bible is often cited as the basis for excluding women from positions of authority in the church. For example, God created Adam first, and Eve is called Adam’s “helper.” When Jesus called the disciples, he called twelve men and no women. And when Paul offered instructions about deacons, he specified that they should be the husband of one wife—he never says the wife of one husband. The

---

<sup>87</sup> Some conservative Bible scholars include Gordon Fee, F.F. Bruce, John Stott, and I. Howard Marshall.

Bible itself seems to have been written exclusively by men. (“The Case for Women”)

He shows how Christians used proof texts from the Bible “that seemed just as clear, unequivocal, and certain to support the institution of slavery in America.” In fact, in his literalistic reading, he offers how that “many of these passages appear in the same contexts as verses that are used to support the subordination of women” (*The Case for Women*).

In order to free women to have a voice in the church, Boyd proceeds to read 1 Timothy 2:11 literalistically pointing out that “the office of senior pastor does not exist in the New Testament,” and that “the distinction between the highest level of authority and other positions of authority is not present in the text”. He concludes his argument by implying that prejudice motivates those who read like Costella.

Paul doesn’t say that women shouldn’t have authority over men in their own culture, he just says, “over a man.” That would mean that a woman under any circumstances, in any condition, in any culture, should not have authority over any man. But even the Catholic Church throughout its history, and certainly the Protestant church, has permitted women to minister in the mission field. In other words, it’s okay to have authority over Chinese men, and over African men, and over Russian men, as long as women don’t have authority over men of their own culture. (*The Case for Women*)

Boyd then concludes his argument with an agenda driven reading of I Corinthians 14:34-35 and says that these verses are not teaching an “eternal truth”. Boyd speaks to the inconsistency in one literalistic reading of this Text which would prevent a woman from even speaking. To those who would literalistically read like this he offers this advice:

If we’re going to interpret these verses literally and apply them consistently, not only should women not teach or have authority, they also should not be allowed to ask questions in church. But I don’t know of any church that would turn away a woman with a question and send her home to ask her husband. What about single women? Are they out of luck? (*The Case for Women*)

Again, as seen here the method of literalistic reading yields two different kinds of answers. And, of course, very much related to these literalistic uses of the Bible to silence or support the voices of women to be heard, is another issue involving another form of subjugation. Should one always submit to one's pastor or deacon?

*To Unconditionally Submit to One's Pastors, or Deacons? Or, to Resist Them?: Examples of the Bible's Literalistic Use from Our Modern Times.* Today, day there are some clergy who insist on their Divine right to hold an office and to authoritatively direct the lives of their church. The idea of the authoritarian role of Puritan leaders still seems to be present in our world. And In light of some of Costella's above statements regarding the exercise of an "authoritative" ministry, this certainly is no surprise ("Does God's Word Allow").

Mark Mattison, for instance, reports how some use Paul's words from Timothy 3:1, 10, 13 to support their agendas for "offices" in the ministry, (a "structure in which person dominates person"). He shows how some leaders go so far as to literalistically read and use as a rule Hebrews 13:17: "Obey your leaders and submit to them for they are keeping watch over your souls and will give an account. Let them do this with joy and not with sighing - for that would be harmful to you" (*Authority in the Church.*)

Yet, in response to this authoritarian motivated literalistic reading of Scripture, there are those who read in the Bible in more liberating ways. This can be seen in the words of an article "*Questions about Submitting to the Pastor*" appearing on a website called Bible.org. Reading Scripture literalistically with the clear objective of liberating church members from an expected unconditional and a bind obedience to a leader; the



author examines, collates, and then synchronizes his literalistic readings into an opinion which he hopes will free his readers of a pastoral, authoritarian dictatorship. In answering one blogger's question about the Bible's expectations for submission to one's pastor or deacon, the writer of this article says:

There is no one man who has authority over the church, as I understand the New Testament. The church is ruled by a plurality of elders, assisted by the deacons (I Timothy 3: Titus 1; Philippians 1:1) I do not believe any one man (be he called the pastor or not) should rule over the church. Neither do I believe that one or a plurality of leaders should rule rough shod over the flock (Matthew 20:25-28). We should submit to our leaders (I Thessalonians 5) elder among others, I must Submit. ("Questions about Submitting to the Pastor")

Obviously, there are those who read the Bible literalistically insisting that church members submit to their pastors unconditionally. There are also others whose literalistic Bible readings support a non-authoritarian practice. Again seen here is how one method of literalistic reading can envision and yield different types of results.

*Summary of the Bible's Rhetorical Use in Some Significant Moments and Issues of History Past and Present.* So to summarize, it seems to the author that the Bible can be literalistically read for many reasons. As just seen, some have read the Bible in ways to validate their decision to take up arms and go to war. Some by reading the Bible literalistically have used it to validate their desires to enslave humans; while others reading the same Bible literalistically have done so to support their abolitionist cause. Again, while some have read the Bible literalistically seeking support for their view about the reality of global warming justifying their efforts to conserve and protect the earth's resources; others 'scientifically' read the same Bible literalistically in order to deny that global warming exists. And while some have literalistically used the Bible to justify a female voice in the leadership of the church, others reading the same Bible literalistically

have used it in order to deny females any voice in public ministry. Finally, while some read the Bible to demand for unconditional support for their church's leaders, others reading the same Bible in the same literalistic ways encourage resistance to such a practice. In short, it seems then that the literalistic reading practices applied to the Bible have continued from Hutchinson's times until now. Many people still read the Bible literalistically seeking to imply divine sanction for their visions or actions. Many people read the same Bible in the same ways resulting in different interpretations.

So what does one say to such a conundrum? Is it possible to study the Bible readings of others in both past and present American texts in ways which can yield insights into the arguments of those with differing viewpoints? And can the insights gained grant thinkers new perspectives about old and perennial problems? I believe the answer to be 'yes'. Once again, there seems to be a need for a New Historicist interdisciplinary reading of the Bible readings of others, one which benefits not just the reader of these transcripts, but one which helps a reader to read other texts which contain readings of the Bible.

### **A Possible Remedy**

This study concludes, then, in the spirit in which it began. Once again, the author has attempted to emphasize that it is important to emphasize 'how' not just 'what' meanings are made when the Bible is read by persons in Hutchinson's transcripts. The researcher has also looked at other American texts, both past and present, which seem to be guided by these same approaches. While she has shown how the Bible has often been used to promote either the socially progressive or regressive agendas of those who quote it, the focus of this study has not been primarily motivated by an analysis of ethics, or the

labeling of some Bible inspired action as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. Value judgments like these are complex, and are best left to the reader, or perhaps another study. Therefore, while the author has sought on many occasions to acknowledge the challenges of the ethical dilemmas; she has also sought to analyze without appraising them. She has devoted her efforts to simply accomplishing an interdisciplinary analysis by using New Historicist predispositions to read the readings of Bible texts appearing in an early American literary text like Hutchinson’s transcripts.

Therefore, this research concludes by suggesting some helpful ways readers might use an interdisciplinary method like the one used in this dissertation to ‘read the readings’ of the Bible in a piece of American literature—both past and present--; and resultantly by reading in these ways determine for herself what socially progressive directions and actions might look like for her current times.

*When reading an early American text containing references and uses of the Bible like those already seen here, the researcher believes it is most productive if one reads in inter-disciplinarian ways. Ideally, one should read as both a literary critic and a Bible critic with a New Historicist predisposition towards both.*

*When reading as a New Historicist literary critic, it seems helpful to pay particular attention to the dimensions of power that are indeed operative within the American text. Isolating the motifs of power, their exercise, and resistance is a vital part of a productive reading strategy. Paying particular attention to the ever present plight of human struggle seen in a given text and asking certain kinds of questions seems profitable: who are the oppressors? Who are the resisters? What is the nature of the*

struggle between the possible authoritarians and liberators within the text? Can a form of intellectual activism be seen taking place in the text itself?

*Secondly, when reading an early or recent American text, a literary critic reading in New Historicist ways might wish to ask this.* Where does power appear as a perennial not merely temporal issue in the text? Where is power's use or abuse seen? Where is its exercise or its resistance? Since the exercise of power is certainly not just part of an antiquated past, how do the ideologies and social concerns of a text extend well beyond its own times? Where do these ideologies and concerns show up later in American history? Reading early or modern American texts as a New Historicist, the critic might also wish to answer these kinds of questions. Where and how do these issues of power associated with this text appear today? And, in what ways are our present times possibly haunted by this very past?

*So then, just as the use of a New Historicist kind of literary criticism helps readers to see the power and perennial issues appearing in a given text, the simultaneous use of a New Historicist Bible criticism can also reveal how the reading or misreading of the Bible's words creates and authorizes the power of an interpreter who quotes it.*

Reading for the ways persons read the Bible in a given text, an analyst might first want to ask: how are Bible readers in the text reading or misreading the Bible's words in order to make their rhetorical point or decision convincing, however noble or ignoble? How is the Bible being used to support possible agendas? Are there any operating subtexts accompanying the reading and rhetorical use of the Bible text? In other words, the observer asks, how and why is this Text being used in this way? What are the possible motivations associated with the Bible being quoted in this particular way?

*A Bible critic reading with a New Historicist attitude, secondly, seeks to know the ways the Bible is interpreted in other American texts of that same period.* Yet, this is never an end in itself. Sometimes the ways the Bible is read in a given text of a specific period is typical. Sometimes it is atypical. For example, Hutchinson's use of a three-fold method of interpretation explanation, collation, and synchrony), was also Cotton's way of approach. She learned it from him, Clearly, Cotton and Hutchinson use the same kind of logical patterns as they approach their readings of the Bible. This knowledge makes one sensitive to the ways reading strategies and styles influence the ways the Bible's evidences in an argument are framed. So then, a productive question seems to be: how is the Bible's reading by one author similar or dissimilar to the ways it is read by others in the same period? By seeing these patterns, one can place the ways of reading the Bible into a bigger hermeneutical context.

*Thirdly, a New Historicist Bible critic, seeks to 'read the readings' of an early American writer to determine if the Bible is being interpreted and invoked in ways that imply or guarantee divine sanction for actions towards others.* She asks what action, real or proposed, is being validated by the Bible to imply divine sanction?

### **Conclusion**

This study, then, is more than just a study of how Bible texts are used in the transcripts of Hutchinson's trials. It is a concrete example of how other similar American texts can be read in interdisciplinary ways using the questions implied by the predispositions and attitudes and concerns associated with both New Historicist literary and Biblical criticisms.

## Questions for Further Discussion

In the spirit of Hutchinson,

- 1.) How does one productively ask questions in the context of the Church?
- 2.) How does one challenge the solely authoritarian pronouncements of Scripture's meaning?
- 3.) If the Bible truly is a literary collection and not a rule book, then what are the implications of approaching the Bible as literature and not as a Puritan Rule Book?
- 4.) Robert Traina in his book *Inductive Bible Study Methodology*, claims there is a difference between observation and interpretation when it comes to the reading of a Bible text? Is this possible? Is this desirable in the interpretive processes? How might this be done?
- 5.) To what other American texts, both past and present, can this same kind of interdisciplinary reading be applied?

## REFERENCES

- Administration. *Questions on Submitting to the Pastor*. September 2001. 05 March 2016.  
<<https://bible.org/question/i-have-some-questions-submission-pastors-and-deacons-authority-and-leaving-church>>.
- Augur, Helen. *An American Jezebel: The Life of Anne Hutchinson*. New York: none given, 1930.
- Baker, Carolyn. "Not Guilty! The Hermeneutics of Anne Hutchinson." *Linguistic Circle of North Dakota and Manitoba*. Aberdeen South Dakota: Linguistic Circle of North Dakota, 2012. on-line.
- Baker, Carolyn. "Whose City is it Anyway?" Ed. Dale Sullivan, Bruce Maylath and Russell Hurst. *Revisiting the Past through Rhetorics of Memory and Amnesia: Selected Papers from the 50th Meeting of the Linguistic Circle of Manitoba and North Dakota*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2010.
- Barker-Benfield, Ben. "Anne Hutchinson and the Puritan Attitude Toward Women." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger, 1981. 99-110. Print. Barry, John. "God, Government and Roger Williams' Big Idea." January 2012. *Smithsonianmag.com*. 23 November 2015. <<http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/god-government-and-roger-williams-big-idea-6291280/?no-ist>>.

- Barton, David. *WallBuilders*. 2003. 06 March 2016. Batts, Emery. "Mrs. Hutchinson's Behavior in Terms of Menopausal Symptoms." Bremer, Francis. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger Publishing Company, 1981. 16-17. Print.
- Batts, Emery. *Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Emery. "Thine Eyes Shall See Thy Teachers." Bremer, Francis J. *Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Ed. Francis J. Bremer. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger Publishing Company, 1981. 11-15.
- Boyd, Greg. "The Case for Women in Ministry." December 2007. *ReKnew.org*. 06 March 2016. <<http://reknew.org/2007/12/women-in-ministry>>.
- Brinton, Henry G. "In Civil War, The Bible became a weapon." 2 February 2011. *USA Today*. 02 December 2015.
- <[usatoday/30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/2011-02-28-column28\\_ST\\_N.htm](http://usatoday/30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/2011-02-28-column28_ST_N.htm)>.
- Buchanan, Lindal. "A Study of Maternal Rhetoric: Anne Hutchinson, Monsters, and the Antinomian Controversy." *Rhetoric Review* (2006): 239-256.
- Byrd, James P. *Sacred Scripture, Sacred War: The Bible and the American Revolution*. New York: Oxford, 2013. Print.
- Caldwell, Patricia. "The Antinomian Language Controversy." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1981. 85-95. Print.



- Cameron, Jean. *Anne Hutchinson, Guilty or Not?: A Closer Look at Her Trials*. Series IX. Vol. 146. New York: Peter Lang, 1994. Print.
- Colarcurcio, Michael. "Footsteps of Anne Hutchinson." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger Publishing Company, 1981. 124-139. Print.
- Costella, Matt. "Does God's Word Allow a Woman to Serve as a Pastor in the Church? A Study in the Pastoral Epistles." *Foundation Magazine* July/August 2001. December 2015.  
<<http://www.rapidnet.com/~jbeard/bdm/Psychology/eccl/women.htm>>.
- Cotton, John. "A Brief Account of the State of the Province of the Massachusetts-Bay in New England Civil and Ecclesiastical by a Lover of His Country." Ed. Ebenezer Pemberton. T. Crump, for Gillam Phillips and Sold at his Shop, over against the West End of the Town House, 1896.
- Cotton, John. *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace*. Third. London, 1671.
- Cotton, John. 1630. Ed. Reiner Smolinski. Digital Commons at the University of Nebraska. E-Book. 25 July 2015.  
<<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=etas>>.
- Cotton, John "Treatise of I Faith II. Twelve Fundamental Articles of Christian Religion III. A Doctrinal Conclusion and IV Questions and Answers Upon Church Govenrment." 1713. *tripod.brynmawr.edu/find/Record/.b3077615*. Bartholomew Green. E-Book. 25 July 2015.  
<<https://tripod.brynmawr.edu/find/Record/.b3077615>>.
- Curtis, Edith. *Anne Hutchinson: A Biography*. London: Cambridge, 1930.

- Davidson, Edward H. "John Cotton's Biblical Exegesis: Method and Purpose." *Early American Literature* 1982: 119-38.
- Delahoyde, Michael. *Literature*. 06 January 2011. 06 February 2016. <  
<http://public.wsu.edu/~delahoyd/new.hist.>>.
- Dittmore, Michael P. "A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson's 'Immediate Revelation'." *William and Mary Quarterly* 57.2 (2000): 349-92.
- Dunn, Mary Maples. "Saints and Sisters." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1981. 140-149. Print.
- Erickson, Kai T. "Wayward Puritans." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of The Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger, 1981. 71-84. Print.
- Etulain, Richard. "Review of David D. Hall Book, "The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638"." *American Quarterly*, Vol. 12 21.2, Part 2 (1969): 352-3. Print.
- Foster, Stephen. "New England and the Challenge of Heresy, 1630-1660: The Puritan Crisis in Transatlantic Perspective." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 38.4 (1981): 624-60. Print.
- Gordis, Lisa. "Opening the Text: Introduction." *Bible Reading and Authority in Puritan New England*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003. 1-11.
- Gray, Tim. "Do You Read the Bible Literally?" 2001. *Catholic Education Resource Center*. 06 March 2016.

- Green, Samuel, Franklin B Dexter, Edward T. Young, Samuel F. McCleary and Arthur Lord. "The Massachusetts Historical Society." 1887-1889. *Massachusetts Historical Society*. 22 January 2013. <[jstor.org/stable/25079680](http://jstor.org/stable/25079680)>.
- Hall, David. "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy on Trial: A Review Essay." *The Harvard Theological Review* 95.4 (2002): 437-52.
- Hall, David. "The Antinomian Controversy." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger, 1981. 19-27. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution*. London: Penguin, 1993. print.
- Holy Bible.
- Hulston, James. *A Rational Millennium*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Kaufmann, Michael W. "Post-Secular Puritans: Recent Retrials of Anne Hutchinson." *Early American Literature* 45.1 (2008): 31-59.
- King, Winnifred. *Unafraid: A Life of Anne Hutchinson*. Boston and New York: none given, 1930.
- Koehler, Lyle. "The Case of the American Jezebels." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert K. Kreiger, 1981. 112-123. Print.
- Martin, Rod. "Answers Research Journal." 26 May 2010. *Answers in Genesis*. Creation Research Institute. 07 March 2016. <<https://Answersingenesis.org/environmental-science/climate-change/a-proposed-bible-science-persspective-on-global-warming/>>.

- Morgan, Edmund S. "The Case Against Anne Hutchinson." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger, 1981. 48-55. Print.
- Morgan, Edmund S. "The Case Against Anne Hutchinson." *The New England Quarterly* (1937): 635-649.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970.
- Rosenmeir, Jesper. "The Image of Adam and the Image of Christ." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1981. 38-47. Print.
- Ryken, Leland. *Worldly Saints*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986. Print.
- Schutte, Jacobson. "'Such Monstrous Births': A Neglected Aspect of the Antinomian Controversy." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.3 (1985): 85-106. Print.
- Shields, David S. "Joy and Dread Among the Early Americanists." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 57.3 (2000): 635-40. 29 January 2015.  
<[www.jstor.org/stable/2674269](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2674269)>.
- Stiles, Ezra, ed. "October Meeting, 1888. Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson; Letter of Jeremiah Dummer; Boston Writing Schools in 1755; Memoir of Williams Latham" Author(s): Samuel A. Green, Franklin B. Dexter, Edward J. Young, Samuel F. McCleary and Arthur Lord Reviewed Work(s) Boston: Boston Historical Society, 1770. 158-198. 22 January 2013.  
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25079680>>.

- Stoeever, William K. B. "The Theological Dimension." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of the Puritan Zone*. Huntington: Robert E. Kreiger Publishing Company, 1981. 27-37. Print.
- Traina, Robert. *Methodological Bible Study: A new Approach to Hermeneutics*. New York: Grannis and Harris, 1952. Print.
- Van Hoozer, Kevin. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998. Print.
- Westerkamp, Marilyn. "Anne Hutchinson, Sectarian, Mysticism, and the Puritan Order." *Church History* 59.4 (1990): 482-96.
- Winthrop, John. n.d. *The Gilder Lehrman Collection*. Letter. 30 June 2015. <[www.gilderlehrman.org](http://www.gilderlehrman.org)>.
- Winthrop, John. "John Winthrop, A Model of Christian Charity: A Reader's Edition." 1996 August 1996. *Hanover Historical Texts Project*. Ed. Monica Banas. 30 June 2015. <<https://history.hanover.edu/texts/winthmod.html>>.
- Winthrop, John. *A SHORT STORY of the Rise, Reign, and Ruin of the Antinomians, Familists, and Libertines That Infected the CHURCHES Of New-England: And how they were Confuted by The Assembly of Ministers there: As also of the Magistrates proceedings in Court against them*. Ed. Thomas Weld. London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1692. 08 July 2015. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>>.
- Winthrop, John. "The Journal of John Winthrop 1630-1649." Ed. Dunn Richard S. & Laetitia Yeandle. Abridged. Boston: Belknap/Harvard, 1996. Print.

Witherington, Anne F. and Jack Schwartz. "The Political Trial." Bremer, Francis J. *Anne Hutchinson: Troubler of Puritan Zion*. Huntington: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1981. 63-71. Print.